arXiv:1406.4637v2 [math.DG] 21 Oct 2015

CYCLIC SURFACES AND HITCHIN COMPONENTS IN RANK 2

FRANÇOIS LABOURIE

Abstract. We prove that given a Hitchin representation in a split real rank 2 group G_0, there exists a unique equivariant minimal surface in the corresponding symmetric space. As a corollary, we obtain a parametrisation of the Hitchin component by a Hermitian bundle over Teichmüller space. The proof goes through introducing holomorphic curves in a suitable bundle over the symmetric space of G_0. Some partial extensions of the construction hold for cyclic bundles in higher rank.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Minimal surfaces 2
1.2. Parametrisation of Hitchin components 3
1.3. Kähler structures 3
1.4. Area rigidity 4
1.5. Cyclic Higgs bundles 4
1.6. Cyclic surfaces and the idea of the proof 4
2. Lie theory preliminaries 5
2.1. Roots 5
2.2. Cyclic roots and projections 6
2.3. The principal 3-dimensional subalgebras 8
2.4. The maximal compact subgroup and the first conjugation 9
2.5. The split real form and the second conjugation 10
3. Hitchin–Kostant quadruples 11
3.1. Definitions 12
3.2. The stabiliser of a Hitchin–Kostant quadruple 12
4. The space of Hitchin–Kostant quadruples 13
4.1. Preliminary: forms with values in a Lie algebra bundle 13
4.2. Geometry of the space of Hitchin–Kostant quadruples 14
4.3. The cyclic decomposition of the Maurer-Cartan form 17
5. Higgs bundles and Hitchin theory 18
5.1. Higgs bundles and the self duality equations 19
5.2. The Hitchin section 19
5.3. Cyclic Higgs bundles 21
5.4. Harmonic mappings and Higgs bundles 21
6. Cyclic surfaces 22
6.1. From cyclic surfaces to Higgs bundles 23

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the *European Community*'s seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ERC *grant agreement* n° FP7-246918.

6.2. From cyclic Higgs bundles to cyclic surfaces 25
6.3. Cyclic surfaces as holomorphic curves 26
7. Infinitesimal rigidity 27
7.1. Preliminary: variation of Pfaffian systems 27
7.2. Cyclic surfaces as solutions of a Pfaffian system 29
7.3. Infinitesimal deformation of cyclic surfaces 29
7.4. Computations of first derivatives 31
7.5. Again, computation of first derivatives 32
7.6. Computation of second order derivatives 34
7.7. Proof of the infinitesimal rigidity 35
8. Properness and the final argument 39
8.1. A theorem in differential calculus 39
8.2. Proof of the main Theorem 42
9. The Kähler structures 42
9.1. Positive Hermitian bundles 43
9.2. Pushforward bundles 43
9.3. The Kähler property 44
10. Area rigidity 44
10.1. Forms 45
10.2. Proof of the Area Rigidity Theorem 47
References 47

1. Introduction

We will study in this article minimal surfaces in rank 2 symmetric spaces. More precisely, let G_0 be a split real simple Lie group of rank 2 and $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G}_0)$ be the associated symmetric space. We will take G_0 to be the connected component of the isometry group of $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G}_0)$. The group G_0 is in particular isomorphic to $\mathsf{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$, $\mathsf{PSp}(4,\mathbb{R})$ or $\mathsf{G}_{2,0}$.

Let Σ be a connected oriented closed surface of genus greater than 1. We consider *Hitchin representations* from $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ with values in G_0. Recall that those are deformations of *Fuchsian representations*; that is, discrete faithful representations in the principal SL_2 in G_0 (See Paragraph 5.2.1 for details). The *Hitchin component* $\mathcal{H}(\Sigma,\mathsf{G}_0)$ is then the space of Hitchin representations up to conjugation by the automorphism group of G_0. By Hitchin [26], the Hitchin component is a smooth manifold consisting of irreducible representations. From [34] for $\mathsf{PSL}(n,\mathbb{R})$ (and the split groups contained in such sharing the same principal $\mathsf{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$) completed by Fock and Goncharov [17] for the remaining cases, a Hitchin representation is discrete faithful.

Hitchin representations have a geometric interpretation. For $\mathsf{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})$, Hitchin representations are monodromies of hyperbolic structures, for $\mathsf{PSL}(3,\mathbb{R})$ they are monodromies of convex real projective structures by Choi and Goldman [11], in general Guichard and Wienhard have shown they are monodromies of geometric structures on higher dimensional compact manifolds [23] The special case of $\mathsf{PSL}(4,\mathbb{R})$ has been described by these latter authors as convex foliated projective structures in [22].

1.1. **Minimal surfaces.** One of our two main results is the following

Theorem 1.1.1. *Given a Hitchin representation δ, there exists a unique δ-equivariant minimal mapping from Σ to $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G}_0)$.*

The existence was proved by the author in [36] without any assumption on the rank. The existence only relies on the fact that Hitchin representations are quasi isometric embeddings. Notice that this is not enough to guarantee uniqueness: for some quasifuchsian representations, two minimal surfaces have been constructed by Michael Anderson [1] and arbitrary many by Zheng Huang and Biao Wang [27].

The case of $\mathsf{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$ was obtained by the author in [35]. The new cases are thus $\mathsf{Sp}(4,\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathsf{G}_{2,0}$, however the proof is general. Interestingly enough, the theorem is also valid when G_0 is semisimple, that is $\mathsf{G}_0 = \mathsf{SL}(2,\mathbb{R}) \times \mathsf{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$. This was done by R. Schoen in [44] and see also [7] for generalisations.

1.2. **Parametrisation of Hitchin components.** Using the *Hitchin parametrisation* of the space of minimal surfaces [26, 36] one obtains equivalently the following Theorem

Theorem 1.2.1. *There exists an analytic diffeomorphism, equivariant under the mapping class group action, from the Hitchin component $\mathcal{H}(\Sigma, \mathsf{G}_0)$ for G_0, when G_0 is of real rank 2, to the space of pairs (J, Q) where J is a complex structure on Σ and Q a holomorphic differential with respect to J of degree $\frac{\dim(\mathsf{G}_0)-2}{2}$.*

For $\mathsf{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$, this corollary was obtained by Loftin in [39] and the author in [35] (announced in [33]). Theorem 1.2.1 holds for compact surfaces; in the non compact case, the natural question is to extend the remarkable results that have been obtained in the case of $\mathsf{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$, on one hand for polynomial cubic differentials (Dumas and Wolf [16]) and on the other hand for the unit disk (Benoist and Hulin [4]. Finally, Theorem 1.2.1 also holds for $\mathsf{SL}(2,\mathbb{R}) \times \mathsf{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ by slightly different techniques [12].

1.3. **Kähler structures.** Using the theory of positive bundles and the work of Bo Berndtsson [5], we extend a result obtained for cubic holomorphic differentials by Inkang Kim and Genkai Zhang [29] to get

Proposition 1.3.1. *Let $\mathrm{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_p)$ be a p-tuple of integers greater than 1. Let $\mathcal{E}(\mathrm{m})$ be the holomorphic vector bundle over Teichmüller space whose fibre at a Riemann surface Σ is*

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathrm{m})_\Sigma := \bigoplus_{i=1,\dots,p} H^0\left(\Sigma, \mathcal{K}^{m_i}\right), \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{K}$ is the canonical bundle of Σ.

Then the dual holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{E}(\mathrm{m})^*_\Sigma$ carries a $(p-1)$-dimensional family of mapping class group invariant Kähler metrics, linear along the fibres and whose restriction to the zero section is the Weil–Petersson metric.

The metric and its properties are given explicitly in Section 9. Using the (real) isomorphism between the vector bundles $\mathcal{E}(m)_\Sigma$ and $\mathcal{E}(m)^*_\Sigma$ given by the Petersson metric on the fibres, one gets:

Corollary 1.3.2. *The Hitchin component $\mathcal{H}(\Sigma, \mathsf{G}_0)$, when G_0 is of real rank 2, carries a complex structure and a 1-dimensional family of compatible mapping class group invariant Kähler metrics for which the Fuchsian locus is totally geodesic and whose restriction to the Fuchsian locus is the Weil–Petersson metric.*

Observe that, in this corollary, the complex structure of $\mathcal{H}(\Sigma, \mathsf{G}_0)$ is not the one inherited from the isomorphism given by Theorem 1.2.1. The relation of these metrics and complex structures with other objects such as the Atiyah–Bott–Goldman symplectic form [2, 20], the pressure metric of [10] or the metric exhibited by Qiongling Li [38] for convex projective structures is rather mysterious. However the relation with the pressure metric along the fuchsian locus has been made explicit by Wentworth and the author in [37].

1.4. **Area rigidity.** Let $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$ be the Teichmüller space of Σ. For a Hitchin representation δ, let us define as in [36]

$$\mathrm{MinArea}(\delta) := \inf\{e_\delta(J) \mid J \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)\},$$

where $e_\delta(J)$ is the energy of the unique δ-equivariant harmonic map from the universal cover of Σ equipped with J to $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G}_0)$, equipped with the symmetric metric normalised so that the principal hyperbolic plane has curvature -1. Motivated by a question of Anna Wienhard, we obtain

Theorem 1.4.1. [Area Rigidity] *The following inequality holds*

$$\mathrm{MinArea}(\delta) \geqslant -2\pi\chi(\Sigma). \tag{2}$$

Moreover, the equality holds if and only if δ is a fuchsian representation.

By Katok's Theorem [28], since the intrinsic metric of any minimal surface is non positively curved, we have the inequality

$$\mathrm{MinArea}(\delta) \cdot h(\Sigma) \geqslant -2\pi\chi(\Sigma). \tag{3}$$

Where $h(\Sigma)$ is the entropy of the induced metric on Σ from the equivariant embedding in $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G}_0)$. On the other hand $h(\Sigma) \geqslant h(\delta)$, where $h(\delta)$ is the *entropy* of $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G}_0)/\delta(\pi_1(\Sigma))$ seen as the asymptotic growth of the length of closed geodesics. Thus one immediately gets

$$\mathrm{MinArea}(\delta) \geqslant -\frac{2\pi\chi(\Sigma)}{h(\delta)}. \tag{4}$$

Thus the previous is also a consequence of the *entropy rigidity conjecture* for Hitchin representations, recently proved by Potrie and Sambarino [40]: $h(\delta) \leqslant 1$ with equality if and only if δ is Fuchsian.

1.5. **Cyclic Higgs bundles.** For higher rank, we only have a very partial result. Let m_ℓ be the highest exponent of G_0. Following Baraglia [3], let us call $\mathcal{E}_{m_\ell+1}$ the space of *cyclic bundles*. The Hitchin section gives an analytic map Ψ from the space of cyclic bundles to the Hitchin component $\mathcal{H}(\Sigma, \mathsf{G}_0)$. We then have,

Theorem 1.5.1. *The map $\Psi : \mathcal{E}_{m_\ell+1} \to \mathcal{H}(\Sigma, \mathsf{G}_0)$ is an immersion.*

It would be nice to understand in a geometric way the image of Ψ.

1.6. **Cyclic surfaces and the idea of the proof.** The main idea of the proof is to work with *cyclic surfaces* which are holomorphic curves (in a certain sense) in a bundle X over the symmetric space. First we show in Section 6 that the minimal surfaces associated to Hitchin representations actually lift to X as cyclic surfaces, and conversely every projection of a cyclic surface is minimal. This is strongly related to a work of Baraglia [3] and cousin to a construction by Bolton, Pedit and Woodward in [6]. Then, complexifying the situation and treating cyclic surfaces

as solutions to a Pfaffian system, the core of the proof is to prove an infinitesimal rigidity result for cyclic surfaces in Section 7. To conclude, we use in Section 8 the main result of [36].

This paper would not have existed without numerous and illuminating discussions with Mike Wolf. I thank him very deeply here. I also wish to thank Jean-Benoist Bost, Christophe Mourougane and Nessim Sibony for references. I also want to thank Anna Wienhard for fruitful questions, Brian Collier, Steve Kerckhoff, Qiongling Li, Marco Spinaci and Richard Wentworth for their interest, comments and important corrections on an earlier version. I also warmly thanks the anonymous referees for the numerous improvements that they suggested and the genuine mistakes they made me correct.

2. Lie theory preliminaries

In this section, we review for the convenience of the reader, without proof, roots system theory with applications to the construction of the maximal compact subgroup, and that of the split form of a complex simple Lie group.

We explain that the choice of a Cartan subalgebra, a system of positive roots and a Chevalley system define naturally two commuting anti linear automorphisms of the Lie algebra, whose fixed points are respectively the maximal compact subgroup, and the maximal split real form. We study the basic properties of these objects.

We also introduce the cyclic roots set and prove Proposition 2.2.2 that will play a central rôle in the proof.

The material comes form Baraglia [3], Kostant [31], Hitchin [26], Bourbaki [8]. The only non standard material (which is probably common lore) is in Section 2.2.2.

We will use the following typographic convention: for any Lie group H, we shall denote by $\mathfrak{h}$ its Lie algebra.

2.1. Roots.

We recall the notations and basic facts of the root system theory

- Let G be a complex simple Lie group, with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$.
- Let H be a maximal abelian semisimple subgroup and $\mathfrak{h}$ its Lie algebra called the *Cartan subalgebra*.
- We denote by $\langle .|. \rangle$ the Killing form of $\mathfrak{g}$, and by the same symbol the restriction of the Killing form to $\mathfrak{h}$ and its dual extension to $\mathfrak{h}^* := \hom(\mathfrak{h}, \mathbb{C})$.
- Let $\Delta \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ be the set of roots of $\mathfrak{h}$, let Δ^+ be a choice of positive roots and Π the associated simple roots.
- We denote by $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ the root space of the root α and recall that $\dim(\mathfrak{g}_\alpha) = 1$. The coroot of α is denoted by h_α and satisfies
$$\langle h_\alpha | u \rangle = \frac{2}{\langle \alpha | \alpha \rangle} \alpha(u).$$
The *root space decomposition* is
$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha. \tag{5}$$
- Given a root $\beta = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} n_\alpha \, \alpha$, the *degree* of β is $\deg(\beta) := \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} n_\alpha$.

- The *longest root* is the uniquely defined positive root η so that for any positive root β, $\beta+\eta$ is not a root.
- A *Chevalley base* ([8] Ch. VIII, §2, n.4, Def. 3), is a collection of non zero vectors $\{\mathrm{x}_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Delta}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$ so that
  (1) there exist integers $N_{\alpha,\beta}$ such that for all roots α and β

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{x}_\alpha &\in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha\\ [\mathrm{x}_\alpha,\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha}] &= -\mathrm{h}_\alpha,\\ [\mathrm{x}_\alpha,\mathrm{x}_\beta] &= N_{\alpha,\beta}\mathrm{x}_{\alpha+\beta},\end{aligned}$$

  where by convention $\mathrm{x}_{\alpha+\beta}=0$ if $\alpha+\beta$ is not a root.
  (2) the antilinear endomorphism which sends x_α to $\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha}$ and is $-\mathrm{id}$ on $\mathfrak{h}$ is an antilinear automorphism of $\mathfrak{g}$.

2.2. **Cyclic roots and projections.** Let G, Δ, Δ^+ and Π be as above and η the longest positive root. Recall that we have

$$\forall\alpha\in\Delta^+:\quad \deg(\alpha)\leqslant\deg(\eta),$$

with equality only if $\eta=\alpha$.

Definition 2.2.1. [Cyclic root sets]

(1) The conjugate cyclic root set *is*

$$Z^\dagger := \Pi\cup\{-\eta\}. \tag{6}$$

(2) The cyclic root set *is*

$$Z := \{\alpha\in\Delta\mid -\alpha\in Z^\dagger\}. \tag{7}$$

Observe that $\Delta\setminus\left(Z\sqcup Z^\dagger\right)=\{\alpha,|\deg(\alpha)|\neq 1,\deg(\eta)\}$.

2.2.1. *Projections.* We consider the following projections (whose pairwise disjoint product are zero) from $\mathfrak{g}$ to itself that comes from the decomposition (5)

$$\pi_0:\mathfrak{g}\to\mathfrak{h}, \tag{8}$$

$$\pi:\mathfrak{g}\to\mathfrak{g}_Z := \bigoplus_{\alpha\in Z}\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \tag{9}$$

$$\pi^\dagger:\mathfrak{g}\to\mathfrak{g}_{Z^\dagger} := \bigoplus_{\alpha\in Z^\dagger}\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \tag{10}$$

$$\pi_1:\mathfrak{g}\to\mathfrak{g}_1 := \bigoplus_{\alpha\notin Z\cup Z^\dagger}\mathfrak{g}_\alpha. \tag{11}$$

$$\tag{12}$$

Obviously

$$\pi+\pi^\dagger+\pi_0+\pi_1=\mathrm{Id}.$$

Moreover these projections are Killing orthogonal since the root space decomposition is Killing orthogonal.

2.2.2. *Brackets of cyclic roots.* The main observation about this decomposition is the following trivial but crucial observation

Proposition 2.2.2. [Brackets] *We have*

$$[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{g}_{Z^\dagger}] \subset \mathfrak{g}_{Z^\dagger}, \tag{13}$$
$$[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{g}_{Z}] \subset \mathfrak{g}_{Z}, \tag{14}$$
$$[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{g}_{1}] \subset \mathfrak{g}_{1}, \tag{15}$$
$$[\mathfrak{g}_Z, \mathfrak{g}_{Z^\dagger}] \subset \mathfrak{h}, \tag{16}$$
$$[\mathfrak{g}_Z, \mathfrak{g}_{1}] \subset \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{Z^\dagger}, \tag{17}$$
$$[\mathfrak{g}_{Z^\dagger}, \mathfrak{g}_{1}] \subset \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{Z}, \tag{18}$$
$$[\mathfrak{g}_Z, \mathfrak{g}_{Z}] \subset \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{Z^\dagger} \tag{19}$$
$$[\mathfrak{g}_{Z^\dagger}, \mathfrak{g}_{Z^\dagger}] \subset \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{Z}. \tag{20}$$

Proof. In this proof, we write for any $w \in \mathfrak{g}$

$$w = w_0 + \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta} w_\alpha,$$

where $w_0 \in \mathfrak{h}$ and $w_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$. Observe that Assertions (13),(14) and (15) follows from the fact that

$$[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{g}_\alpha] \subset \mathfrak{g}_\alpha.$$

We will now use the following two facts in the proof

(1) If α and β are distinct simple roots, then $\alpha - \beta$ is not a root.
(2) If α is a positive root and η the longest root then $\alpha + \eta$ is not a root.

Combining the two, we get that if $\alpha \in Z$ and $\beta \in Z^\dagger$ then $[\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \mathfrak{g}_\beta] \neq \{0\}$ if and only if $\alpha + \beta = 0$. Thus if $v \in \mathfrak{g}_Z$ and $u \in \mathfrak{g}_{Z^\dagger}$ then

$$[u, v] = [u_\eta, v_{-\eta}] + \sum_{\beta \in \Pi} [u_\beta, v_{-\beta}] \in \mathfrak{h}$$

This proves (16).

Let α be a simple root and $\gamma \notin Z \cup Z^\dagger$ a root of degree a, in particular the degree of $\alpha + \gamma$ (if it is a root) is $a + 1$. Then

- Since $a \neq -1$, then $a + 1 \neq 0$, thus $\pi_0([\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \mathfrak{g}_\gamma]) = \{0\}$,
- Since $a \neq 0$, then $a + 1 \neq 1$, moreover $a + 1 \neq -\deg(\eta)$, thus $\pi_0([\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \mathfrak{g}_Z]) = \{0\}$.

Thus $[g_\alpha, g_\gamma] \subset \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{Z^\dagger}$. Similarly

- Since $a \neq \deg(\eta)$, then $a - \deg(\eta) \neq 0$, thus $\pi_0([\mathfrak{g}_{-\eta}, \mathfrak{g}_\gamma]) = \{0\}$,
- Since $a \neq 0$, then $a - \deg(\eta) \neq -\deg(\eta)$, moreover $a - \deg(\eta) \neq 1$, thus $\pi_0([\mathfrak{g}_{-\eta}, \mathfrak{g}_Z]) = \{0\}$.

This finishes proving Assertion (17). Assertion (18) follows by symmetry.

Finally, Assertion (19) follows from the fact that if α and β belong to Z, then $\alpha + \beta \notin Z$: if α and β are both simple, then $\alpha + \beta$ is not simple and positive, if α is simple and $\beta = -\eta$, then $\alpha + \beta$ is negative and not the longest. Assertion (20) follows by symmetry. □

2.3. **The principal 3-dimensional subalgebras.** We begin by recalling the existence and properties of the principal $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$. Let a in $\mathfrak{h}$ and r_α in $\mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$a := \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha\in\Delta^+} \mathrm{h}_\alpha =: \sum_{\alpha\in\Pi} r_\alpha\, \mathrm{h}_\alpha.$$

Let now

$$X := \sum_{\alpha\in\Pi} \sqrt{r_\alpha}\mathrm{x}_\alpha,\ Y := \sum_{\alpha\in\Pi} \sqrt{r_\alpha}\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha}.$$

Then, we have

Proposition 2.3.1. [Kostant] *The span of (a,X,Y) is a subalgebra $\mathfrak{s}$ isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ so that*

$$[a,X]=X,\quad [a,Y]=-Y,\quad [X,Y]=-a.$$

Moreover for any root α, we have

$$\deg(\alpha)=\alpha(a). \tag{21}$$

We remark that we follow here a mixture of the conventions by Kostant and Bourbaki on the canonical basis for the Lie algebra of $\mathfrak{sl}_2$: no factor of 2 (Kostant), $[X,Y]=-a$ (Bourbaki). In our case $Y=-X^t$, although a very classical convention (actually Kostant's) is to have $Y=X^t$.

Definition 2.3.2. [Principal subalgebras]

- *A 3-dimensional subalgebra $\mathfrak{s}$ isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ is a* principal subalgebra *if it contains an element conjugate to X (and then an element conjugate to a).*
- *A principal subalgebra is an* $\mathfrak{h}$-principal subalgebra*, if it intersects non trivially the Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ and the intersection contains the sum a of the positive coroots.*
- *A* principal SL_2 *in a complex semisimple group is a group whose Lie algebra is a principal subalgebra.*
- *A* principal SL_2 *in a split real group is a split real group whose complexification is a principal* SL_2*.*

As an example, the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{s}$ generated by (a,X,Y) is an $\mathfrak{h}$-principal subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. We then have from Theorem 4.2 in [31],

Proposition 2.3.3. *Any two principal subalgebra are conjugate, and moreover any two $\mathfrak{h}$-principal subalgebras are conjugated by an element of H.*

2.3.1. *Exponents and decomposition under the principal subalgebra.* We use the notation of the previous paragraph. Let $\ell := \mathrm{rank}(\mathsf{G})$. Then have

Proposition 2.3.4. [Kostant] *There exists a increasing sequence of integers $\{m_1,\dots,m_\ell\}$ called the* exponents *of G such that the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ decomposes as the sum of ℓ irreducible representations of $\mathfrak{s}$*

$$\mathfrak{g}=\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}\mathfrak{v}_i,$$

with $\dim(\mathfrak{v}_i) = 2m_i + 1$. *Moreover* $\mathfrak{v}_1 = \mathfrak{s}$. *Finally, if* $\mathfrak{s}$ *is an* $\mathfrak{h}$*-principal subalgebra, we have the* Kostant splitting

$$\mathfrak{h} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathfrak{a}_i,$$

where $\mathfrak{a}_i = \mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{v}_i$ *are of dimension 1 and called the* Kostant lines.

Observe that $m_1 = 1$. For a rank 2 group, we furthermore have

$$m_2 = \frac{\dim(\mathsf{G}) - 4}{2}$$

Thus for $\mathsf{G}_{2,0}$, $m_2 = 5$, for $\mathsf{Sp}(4, \mathbb{R})$, $m_2 = 3$, for $\mathsf{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$, $m_2 = 2$.

Fixing now a Chevalley base and the associated generators (a, X, Y) of $\mathfrak{s}$, we recall that a *highest weight vector* in $\mathfrak{v}_i$ is an eigenvector e_i of a satisfying $[e_i, X] = 0$. The highest weight vectors in $\mathfrak{v}_i$ generate a line. Observe that we have

Proposition 2.3.5. *Let* η *be the longest root. Then*

$$m_\ell = \deg(\eta), \tag{22}$$

and x_η *is a highest weight vector in* $\mathfrak{v}_\ell$.

2.4. **The maximal compact subgroup and the first conjugation.** Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a Cartan subalgebra. An $\mathfrak{h}$*-Cartan involution* is an antilinear Lie algebra automorphism ρ, globally preserving $\mathfrak{h}$, satisfying $\rho^2 = 1$ and so that $(u, v) \mapsto -\langle u | \rho(v) \rangle$ is definite positive. A *Cartan involution* is an $\mathfrak{h}$-Cartan involution for some $\mathfrak{h}$.

We finally define the *symmetric space* of G to be the space $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$ of Cartan involutions.

From [8] and specifying Property 2 of Chevalley basis, we have

Proposition 2.4.1. *Given a Chevalley base* $\{\mathrm{x}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Delta}$, *there exists a unique* $\mathfrak{h}$*-Cartan involution* ρ *so that*

$$\rho(\mathrm{x}_\alpha) = \mathrm{x}_{-\alpha}. \tag{23}$$

Moreover this Cartan involution preserves the principal subalgebra associated to the Chevalley basis as in Proposition 2.3.1.

Observe that we follow the convention of Bourbaki and other authors may have different conventions due to different conventions on defining Chevalley bases. The following proposition summarises some useful properties.

Proposition 2.4.2. *Any two* $\mathfrak{h}$*-Cartan involutions are conjugated by an element of* H. *An* $\mathfrak{h}$*-Cartan involution preserves* $\mathfrak{h}$, *send roots to opposite roots, coroots* h_α *to their opposite, and* $\mathfrak{g}_1$ *(cf. Section 2.2.1) to itself.*

The group G *acts transitively on* $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$, *and the stabiliser at a Cartan involution* ρ *is a maximal compact subgroup* K *so that* $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$ *is isomorphic as a homogeneous* G*-space with* G/K.

The symmetric space is equipped with an interesting geometry. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the trivial $\mathfrak{g}$ bundle over $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$ with its trivial connection D. We define the *Maurer–Cartan* form $\omega \in \Omega^1(\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G}), \mathcal{G})$ as the identification of $\mathsf{T}_\rho(\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G}))$ with $\mathfrak{p} = \{u \mid \rho(u) = -u\}$. Observe also that by construction we have a section ρ of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ such that $\rho(x) = x$ where in the right term x is considered as an involution of $\mathfrak{g}$. We thus have a Riemannian metric g on $\mathcal{G}$, defined by $g(u, v) = -\langle u | \rho(v) \rangle$.

Then we have

Proposition 2.4.3. *The connection* $\nabla := \mathsf{D} - \mathrm{Ad}(\omega)$ *preserves the metric* g.

2.5. **The split real form and the second conjugation.** In this subsection we review the construction of the maximal split real form following Kostant [31]. We will prove.

Proposition 2.5.1. *Let* $\mathfrak{h}$ *be a Cartan subalgebra equipped with a system of positive roots. Let* ρ *be an* $\mathfrak{h}$*-Cartan involution preserving an* $\mathfrak{h}$*-principal subalgebra* $\mathfrak{s}$*. Then there exists a unique linear involution* σ *of* $\mathfrak{g}$ *with the following properties.*

1. *The involution* σ *is an automorphism of* $\mathfrak{g}$ *that preserves globally and non trivially* $\mathfrak{s}$*, such that* $\sigma|_{\mathfrak{a}_i} = (-1)^{m_i+1}$.
2. *The involution* σ *commutes with* ρ.
3. *The set of fixed points of* $\sigma \circ \rho$ *is the Lie algebra of the split real form* G_0 *of* G.
4. *if* η *is the longest root then* $\sigma(\mathrm{h}_\eta) = \mathrm{h}_\eta$.
5. *the automorphism* σ *preserves globally* $\mathfrak{g}_Z$ *and* $\mathfrak{g}_{Z^\dagger}$.

The Kostant lines $\mathfrak{a}_i$ are defined in Proposition 2.3.4. The first condition actually implies that if (a, X, Y) is the basis constructed of $\mathfrak{s}$ from the Cartan involution ρ, then $\sigma(a, X, Y) = (a, -X, -Y)$.

2.5.1. *Existence of* σ. We sketch the construction of σ due to Kostant and prove the existence part of Proposition 2.5.1 . Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a Cartan subalgebra with its set of roots Δ, set of positive roots Δ^+ and set of simple roots Π. We also fix a Chevalley base $\{\mathrm{x}_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Delta}$ and denote by $\mathfrak{s}$ the associated principal subalgebra.

Let $\mathfrak{z} = \ker(\mathrm{ad}(X))$, observe that $\mathfrak{z}$ is the vector space generated by the highest weight vectors for the action of $\mathfrak{s}$ for all the $\mathfrak{v}_i$. Observe that $\mathfrak{z}$ and $\mathrm{ad}(Y)$ generates $\mathfrak{g}$. This data thus defines an involution σ on $\mathfrak{g}$ characterised by

$$\sigma|_{\mathfrak{z}} = -1, \quad \sigma(Y) = -Y. \tag{24}$$

Let now ρ be the unique Cartan involution associated to $\mathfrak{h}$ and the choice of the Chevalley basis according to Proposition 2.4.1. From [26], we gather that

Proposition 2.5.2. [Hitchin involution]

1. *The involution* σ *and the antilinear involution* ρ *commute.*
2. *The set of fixed points* $\mathfrak{g}_0$ *of the antilinear involution* $\sigma\circ\rho$ *is the Lie algebra of a split real form* G_0 *of* G.
3. *The set of fixed points of* σ *is the complexification of the Lie algebra of the maximal compact subgroup of* G_0.
4. *Finally, the elements* $a_i := \mathrm{ad}(Y)^{m_i} e_i$*, where* m_i *are the exponents and* e_i *highest weight vectors of* $\mathfrak{v}_i$*, is basis of* $\mathfrak{h}$ *and* $\sigma(a_i) = (-1)^{m_i+1} a_i$.

Observe that given $\mathfrak{s}$ and $\mathfrak{h}$, the vector a_i generates the Kostant line $\mathfrak{a}_i$. A corollary of the last statement and standard results about $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ modules is

Proposition 2.5.3. *The union of* $\mathfrak{h}$ *and* $\mathfrak{s}$ *generates* $\mathfrak{g}$.

We will usually write for any $u \in \mathfrak{g}$,

$$\lambda(u) := \sigma \circ \rho(u).$$

We finally observe the following fact that concludes the proof of the existence part in Proposition 2.5.1 and that we could not find in the literature.

Proposition 2.5.4. [Involution and the longest root] *Let η be the longest root. Then*

$$\sigma(\mathrm{x}_\eta) = -\mathrm{x}_\eta, \;\; \sigma(\mathrm{h}_\eta) = \mathrm{h}_\eta. \tag{25}$$

Moreover σ globally preserves $\mathfrak{g}_Z$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{Z^\dagger}$.

Proof. Since for all positive root α, $\alpha + \eta$ is not a root and thus $[\mathrm{x}_\alpha, \mathrm{x}_\eta] = 0$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathrm{x}_\eta, X] &= \sum_{\alpha\in\Pi} \sqrt{r_\alpha}[\mathrm{x}_\alpha, \mathrm{x}_\eta] = 0, \\ [a, \mathrm{x}_\eta] &= \deg(\eta).\mathrm{x}_\eta. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

In particular, x_η generates an irreducible representation of $\mathfrak{s}$ for which x_η is a highest weight vector. In particular, $\sigma(\mathrm{x}_\eta) = -\mathrm{x}_\eta$. Then since σ commutes with ρ we have

$$\sigma(\mathrm{x}_{-\eta}) = \sigma(\rho(\mathrm{x}_\eta)) = \rho(\sigma(\mathrm{x}_\eta)) = -\rho(\mathrm{x}_\eta) = -\mathrm{x}_{-\eta}.$$

Moreover, σ being an automorphism of the Lie algebra, we have that

$$\sigma(\mathrm{h}_\eta) = -\sigma([\mathrm{x}_\eta, \mathrm{x}_{-\eta})]) = -[\sigma(\mathrm{x}_\eta), \sigma(\mathrm{x}_{-\eta})] = -(-1)^2[\mathrm{x}_\eta, \mathrm{x}_{-\eta}] = \mathrm{h}_\eta.$$

Finally, σ is an automorphism of $\mathfrak{g}$ preserving $\mathfrak{h}$, thus sending roots to roots. Since σ preserves the longest coroot, it preserves the degree and thus send simple roots to simple roots. □

The next proposition follows from the remark following the definition of σ,

Proposition 2.5.5. [Involution and the principal subgroup] *We have*

$$\lambda(Y) = -X, \;\; \lambda(X) = -Y, \;\; \lambda(a) = -a. \tag{27}$$

2.5.2. *Uniqueness of σ.* We now prove the uniqueness part of Proposition 2.5.1

Proposition 2.5.6. *Let $\mathfrak{h}$ equipped with a system of positive roots and $\mathfrak{s}$ be an $\mathfrak{h}$-principal subalgebra. Then there exists a unique linear involution σ such that*

(1) σ is an automorphism of $\mathfrak{g}$,
(2) σ preserves globally $\mathfrak{s}$ and $\mathfrak{h}$, and is non trivial on $\mathfrak{s}$
(3) σ fixes pointwise $\mathfrak{s} \cap \mathfrak{h}$,
(4) $\sigma(a_i) = (-1)^{m_i+1}a_i$,

Proof. If σ_1 and σ_2 are two such involutions. Let $I = \sigma_1 \circ \sigma_2$. Then I fixes $\mathfrak{h}$ pointwise. Since I fixes $\mathfrak{s}$ pointwise by the remark following Proposition 2.5.1, it follows that I fixes the Lie algebra generated by $\mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathfrak{s}$ that is $\mathfrak{g}$ by Proposition 2.5.3. □

3. Hitchin–Kostant quadruples

In this section, we introduce the basic algebraic concept used by Hitchin in the construction of the *Hitchin section* that we explain in the next section.

3.1. **Definitions.** Let G be a complex simple group.

Definition 3.1.1. *A* Hitchin–Kostant quadruple *is a quadruple* $(\mathfrak{h}, \Delta^+ \rho, \lambda)$ *where*

- $\mathfrak{h}$ *is a Cartan subalgebra equipped with a system of positive roots* Δ^+,
- ρ *is an antilinear involution globally fixing* $\mathfrak{h}$ *whose set of fixed points is the Lie algebra of a maximal compact subgroup,*
- λ *is an antilinear involution commuting with* ρ*, globally fixing* $\mathfrak{h}$ *whose set of fixed points is the Lie algebra of a maximal split real form,*
- ρ *and* λ *both fixes globally the same* $\mathfrak{h}$*-principal subalgebra* $\mathfrak{s}$ *and* $\rho \circ \lambda$ *and more over* $\rho(a_i) = (-1)^{m_i+1}\lambda(a_i)$ *for* a_i *in the Kostant line* $\mathfrak{a}_i$.

We will also use the notation $\sigma := \lambda \circ \rho$. By Proposition 2.5.1, Hitchin–Kostant quadruples exist. Moreover:

Proposition 3.1.2. *Any two Hitchin–Kostant quadruples are conjugate.*

Proof. Let $(\mathfrak{h}_1, \Delta_1^+, \rho_1, \lambda_1)$ and $(\mathfrak{h}_2, \Delta_2^+, \rho_2, \lambda_2)$ be two Hitchin–Kostant quadruples. Let $\mathfrak{s}_i$ be the $\mathfrak{h}_i$-principal subalgebra fixed globally by ρ_i and λ_i. Let $\sigma_i = \lambda_i \circ \rho_i$. By Proposition 2.3.3, we can as well assume after conjugation that

$$(\mathfrak{h}_1, \mathfrak{s}_1) = (\mathfrak{h}_2, \mathfrak{s}_2) =: (\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{s}).$$

Thus by Proposition 2.5.6, $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$. Applying Proposition 2.4.2 to $\mathfrak{s}$, we can further use a conjugation by an element of $\exp(\mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{s})$ so that the restrictions of ρ_1 and ρ_2 coincide on $\mathfrak{s}$. Thus $\rho_1 \circ \rho_2$ is the identity on $\mathfrak{s}$ and is also the identity on $\mathfrak{h}$ by Proposition 2.4.2 (two $\mathfrak{h}$-Cartan involutions have the same restriction on $\mathfrak{h}$). Since $\mathfrak{s}$ and $\mathfrak{h}$ generates $\mathfrak{g}$ by Proposition 2.5.3, it follows that $\rho_1 = \rho_2$, thus $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ and the result follows. □

3.2. **The stabiliser of a Hitchin–Kostant quadruple.** Let $(\mathfrak{h}, \Delta^+ \rho, \lambda)$ be a Hitchin–Kostant quadruple. Let K be the maximal compact subgroup in G stabilising ρ and similarly G_0 the split real form stabilising λ in G. From Section 6 in Hitchin [26], we have

Proposition 3.2.1. [Hitchin] *The group* $\mathsf{K}_0 := \mathsf{K} \cap \mathsf{G}_0$ *is a maximal compact subgroup of* G_0*. The algebra* $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \cap \mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{k}$ *is the Lie algebra of maximal torus* T *of* K_0.

Observe that G acts by conjugation on the space X of Hitchin quadruples.

Proposition 3.2.2. *The stabiliser in* G *of the Hitchin–Kostant quadruple* $(\mathfrak{h}, \Delta^+; \rho, \lambda)$ *is* T.

Proof. The normaliser of $\mathfrak{h}$ equipped with a system of positive roots is H. The normaliser of λ is included in G_0 since it normalises the set of fixed points of λ. The normaliser of ρ is similarly included in K. The result follows. □

Proposition 3.2.3. *We have the following*

1. *We have* $\mathrm{h}_\eta \in \mathfrak{t}_\mathbb{C}$,
2. *For* $\mathsf{G} = \mathsf{SL}(3, \mathbb{C})$*, for all simple root* α*,* $\mathrm{h}_\alpha \notin \mathfrak{t}_\mathbb{C}$.
3. *If* G *is* G_2 *or* $\mathsf{Sp}(4, \mathbb{C})$ *Then* $\sigma|_\mathfrak{h} = 1$*, or in other words* $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{t}_\mathbb{C}$.

Proof. We first prove Statement (1). Since $\sigma(\mathrm{h}_\eta) = \mathrm{h}_\eta$ by Proposition 2.5.4, and $\mathfrak{t}_\mathbb{C}$ is the set of fixed points of σ in $\mathfrak{h}$ statement follows.

We now prove Statement (3). In that case, since G is of rank 2, we have only two representations of $\mathfrak{s}$ appearing in $\mathfrak{g}$. Let x_1 and x_2 be the corresponding highest weight vectors. In that case the exponent m_1 and m_2 are both odd. Thus let $a_i = \mathrm{ad}(Y)^{m_i}\mathrm{x}_i$, then $\sigma(a_i) = a_i$. But the a_i generate $\mathfrak{h}$ by the last assertion of Proposition 2.5.2.

We finally prove Statement (2). When $\mathsf{G} = \mathsf{SL}(3,\mathbb{C})$, the two exponents have different parity, thus $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is of dimension 1; it follows from Property (1) that $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathrm{h}_\eta.\mathbb{C}$. Since for all simple root α, h_α is not collinear to h_η, the result follows.

The result now follows. □

4. The space of Hitchin–Kostant quadruples

Our goal now is to describe the geometry of the homogeneous G-space X of Hitchin–Kostant quadruples. In particular we wish to describe a Lie algebra bundle over X which come equipped with a connection, a metric and other differential geometric devices.

4.1. **Preliminary: forms with values in a Lie algebra bundle.** We shall in the sequel study forms on a manifold M with values in a Lie algebra bundle $\mathcal{G}$. We store in this paragraph the formulas that we shall use later.

We denote by $\Omega^*(M,\mathcal{G})$ the graded vector space of forms on M with values in $\mathcal{G}$. We say a form α in $\Omega^*(M,\mathcal{G})$ is *decomposable* if $\alpha = \widehat{\alpha}\otimes A$ where A is a section of $\mathcal{G}$ and $\widehat{\alpha}$ a form on M. We recall the existence of a unique linear binary operation $\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}$

$$\Omega^p(M,\mathcal{G})\otimes\Omega^q(M,\mathcal{G})\to\Omega^{p+q}(M,\mathcal{G}),$$

so that if $\alpha = \widehat{\alpha}\otimes A$, $\beta = \widehat{\beta}\otimes B$ are decomposable forms then

$$\alpha\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}\beta = \left(\widehat{\alpha}\wedge\widehat{\beta}\right)\otimes[A,B]. \tag{28}$$

Similarly, if α and β are $\mathcal{G}$ valued forms of degree, $\langle\alpha|\beta\rangle$ is the form defined for decomposable forms $\alpha = \widehat{\alpha}\otimes A$ and $\beta = \widehat{\beta}\otimes B$ by

$$\langle\alpha|\beta\rangle := (\widehat{\alpha}\wedge\widehat{\beta})\otimes\langle A|B\rangle$$

We will use the following facts freely. If α and β are respectively of degree p and q, and if $\xi\in\chi^\infty(M)$

$$\alpha\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}\beta = (-1)^{pq+1}\beta\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}\alpha \tag{29}$$

$$i_\xi(\alpha\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}\beta) = i_\xi\alpha\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}\beta + (-1)^p\alpha\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}i_\xi\beta \tag{30}$$

$$\langle\gamma|\beta\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}\alpha\rangle = (-1)^{pq+1}\langle\gamma\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}\alpha|\beta\rangle. \tag{31}$$

If α and β are 1-form and γ a 0-form then

$$\alpha\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}(\gamma\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}\beta) + \beta\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}(\gamma\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}\alpha) = \gamma\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}(\alpha\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}\beta). \tag{32}$$

If furthermore $\mathcal{G}$ is equipped with a connection and if d is the corresponding exterior derivative on $\Omega^*(M,\mathcal{G})$, then for α of degree p

$$\mathrm{d}(\alpha\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}\beta) = \mathrm{d}\alpha\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}\beta + (-1)^p\alpha\mathbin{\mathsf{\wedge}}\mathrm{d}\beta. \tag{33}$$

Finally recall a convention of notation: if α belongs to $\Omega(\mathsf{X},\mathcal{G})$, and f is a map from Σ to X, then $f^*(\alpha)$ is a form with values in $f^*(\mathcal{G})$.

Let S be a Riemann surface, $\mathcal{G}$ a Lie algebra bundle over S equipped with a section of Cartan involution ρ. Then we have

Proposition 4.1.1. *Let α be a $(1,0)$ form with value in $\mathcal{G}$, then*

$$i\int_S \langle \alpha | \rho(\alpha)\rangle \leqslant 0, \tag{34}$$

with equality if and only if $\alpha = 0$. Conversely if α is of type $(0,1)$ then

$$i\int_S \langle \alpha | \rho(\alpha)\rangle \geqslant 0, \tag{35}$$

with equality if and only if $\alpha = 0$.

Proof. Let us first consider a form $\alpha = \widehat{\alpha}\otimes A$, where A is a section of $\mathcal{G}$ and $\widehat{\alpha}$ a $(1,0)$-form on S. Then $\rho(\alpha) = \overline{\widehat{\alpha}}\otimes\rho(A)$. Thus for every x in S, $u\in \mathsf{T}S$, we have

$$i\,\langle \alpha|\rho(\alpha)\rangle_x(u,Ju) = i\,\langle A|\rho(A)\rangle_x \widehat{\alpha}\wedge\overline{\widehat{\alpha}}_x\,(u,Ju) \leqslant 0. \tag{36}$$

with equality only if $\alpha_x = 0$. Given a point x, we can now decompose any form α as the sum of decomposable forms $\widehat{\alpha}_i\otimes A_i$ where the A_i are pairwise orthogonal with respect to $A,B\mapsto\langle A|\rho(B)\rangle$ and obtain the same statement. The result follows. □

4.2. **Geometry of the space of Hitchin–Kostant quadruples.**

4.2.1. *Vector subbundles.* The group G act by conjugation on the space X of Hitchin–Kostant quadruples. Moreover once we fix a Hitchin–Kostant quadruple $(\mathfrak{h},\Delta^+,\rho,\lambda)$ then X is identified with G/T by Proposition 3.2.2, where $\mathsf{T}\subset\mathsf{H}$ be the torus fixed by the involutions λ and ρ. Recall then that T is compact and is the maximal torus of the maximal compact of G_0 by Proposition 3.2.1.

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the trivial bundle $\mathcal{G} := \mathfrak{g}\times\mathsf{X}$ equipped with the trivial connection D. The following definitions introduce some of the geometry of X.

Definition 4.2.1. [Vector bundles] *We denote by $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{H}_0$, the subbundles of $\mathcal{G}$ whose fibre at $(\mathfrak{h},\Delta^+,\rho,\lambda)$ are respectively*

$$\mathfrak{h}, \tag{37}$$

$$\mathfrak{t} := \{u\in\mathfrak{h}\mid \sigma(u)=u,\rho(u)=u\}, \tag{38}$$

$$\mathfrak{h}_0 := \{u\in\mathfrak{h}\mid \forall v\in\mathfrak{t},\langle u|v\rangle = 0\}. \tag{39}$$

Using the root system, we also have a decomposition:

$$\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{H}\oplus\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Delta}\mathcal{G}_\alpha, \tag{40}$$

such that at a point $x=(\mathfrak{h},\rho,\lambda)$, $\mathcal{H}_x=\mathfrak{h}$, and $(\mathcal{G}_\alpha)_x = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, where $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ are the root spaces associated to $\mathfrak{h}$.

At any point $x=(\mathfrak{h},\Delta^+,\rho,\lambda)$ of X, we identify $\mathsf{T}_x\mathsf{X}$ with $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{t}$. We denote by $E^\perp$ the orthogonal with respect to the Killing form.

Definition 4.2.2. [Maurer–Cartan Form] *The* Maurer–Cartan *form on X is the form $\omega\in\Omega^1(\mathsf{X},\mathcal{T}^\perp)\subset\Omega^1(\mathsf{X},\mathcal{G})$ defined as the inverse of the projection from $\mathfrak{t}^\perp$ to $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{t}=\mathsf{T}_x\mathsf{X}$.*

In the sequel we will sloppily identify ω with $\mathrm{ad}(\omega)$. Observe that the Maurer–Cartan form satisfies

$$\forall u\in\mathfrak{t},\quad \langle u|\omega\rangle = 0. \tag{41}$$

4.2.2. *Connections.* Let $b : \mathsf{G} \to \mathrm{End}(V)$, be a linear representation. Let $\mathcal{V} = V \times \mathsf{X}$ be the associated trivial bundle over X equipped with the trivial connection D. We say a section σ of $\mathcal{V}$ is G-*equivariant* if

$$\sigma(g \cdot x) = b(g) \cdot \sigma(x).$$

In particular, since $\sigma(g \cdot x) = b(g) \cdot \sigma(x)$, then for every $u \in \mathfrak{g}$,

$$\mathsf{D}_{\tilde{u}}\sigma = \mathsf{T}b(u) \cdot \sigma,$$

where $\tilde{u}$ is the vector field on X associated to u. Thus a G-equivariant section of $\mathcal{V}$ is parallel under the connection

$$\nabla := \mathsf{D} - \mathsf{T}b \circ \omega.$$

In the next proposition, we will use this fact when b is the adjoint representation.

Proposition 4.2.3. *The subbundles $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{H}_0$ are parallel for the connection $\nabla := \mathsf{D} - \omega$, where ω is the Maurer–Cartan form. Finally the curvature R^∇ belongs to $\Omega^2(\mathsf{X}, \mathcal{T})$.*

In particular since $\nabla + \omega$ is flat, the curvature of ∇ is given by the equation

$$\mathrm{d}^\nabla \omega + \omega \wedge \omega + R^\nabla = 0. \tag{42}$$

Proof. Let S be an G-equivariant section of $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{G})$. Thus, S is parallel under the connection ∇^0 on $\mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{g})$ such that

$$\nabla^0_u S = \mathsf{D}_u S - [\mathrm{ad}(\omega(u)), S].$$

A short computation yields that

$$0 = (\nabla^0_u S)(v) = \nabla_u(S(v)) - S(\nabla_u v).$$

Thus if $w = S(v)$ is section of $\mathrm{Im}(S)$ then,

$$\nabla_u w = S(\nabla_u v) \in \mathrm{Im}(S).$$

In other words, $\mathrm{Im}(S)$ is parallel under ∇.

We obtain the first part of the result by applying this observation for the Killing orthogonal projections on $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{H}_0$ as well as well as the projection on $\mathcal{G}_\alpha$ from the root space space decomposition.

Since ρ and λ are parallel, it follows that the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$ (associated to the maximal compact of G) and $\mathfrak{g}_0$ (associated to the split real form of G) are both parallel, These two algebras being both self normalizing, it follows that $R^\nabla \in \Omega^2(\mathsf{X}, \mathfrak{g}_0 \cap \mathfrak{k})$. Similarly since $\mathfrak{h}$ is parallel and self normalizing, we further have that

$$R^\nabla \in \Omega^2(\mathsf{X}, \mathfrak{g}_0 \cap \mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{h}).$$

The last statement of the proposition follows from the fact that

$$\mathfrak{g}_0 \cap \mathfrak{k} \cap \mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{t}. \quad \square$$

Conversely, we have

Proposition 4.2.4. *Let $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ be a Lie algebra bundle over a connected manifold M equipped with*

1. *a smoothly varying Hitchin–Kostant quadruple $\kappa : m \mapsto (\widehat{\mathfrak{h}}_m, \widehat{\Delta}^+_m, \widehat{\rho}_m, \widehat{\lambda}_m)$ in every fibre.*
2. *a connection $\widehat{\nabla}$ for which the Hitchin–Kostant quadruple κ is parallel.*

(3) an element $\widehat{\omega} \in \Omega^1(M, \mathcal{G})$, such that $\widehat{\mathsf{D}} := \widehat{\nabla} + \mathrm{ad}(\widehat{\omega})$ is flat and moreover

$$\forall u \in \widehat{\mathfrak{t}}, \quad \langle u | \widehat{\omega} \rangle = 0, \tag{43}$$

where $\widehat{\mathfrak{t}} := \{u \in \widehat{h} \mid \widehat{\rho}(u) = u = \widehat{\lambda}(u)\}$.

Then there exists a map f from M in X, unique up to post composition by an element of G, such that $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$, $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$, $\widehat{\Delta}^+$, $\widehat{\rho}$, $\widehat{\lambda}$, $\widehat{\omega}$,$\widehat{\nabla}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}$ are the pulled back of the corresponding objects in $\mathcal{G}$.

As an immediate corollary, we get

Corollary 4.2.5. *Let $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ be a Lie algebra bundle over a simply connected manifold M equipped with the same structure as in Proposition 4.2.4, then there exists*

(1) a representation ρ of $\pi_1(M)$ in G unique up to conjugation,
(2) a ρ-equivariant map f from the universal cover $\widetilde{M}$ of M, in X satisfying the properties in the conclusion of Proposition 4.2.4.

Proof of Proposition 4.2.4. Since $\widehat{\mathsf{D}}$ is flat and M simply connected, we may as well assume that $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ is the trivial flat bundle $\mathcal{G} = \mathfrak{g} \times M$. Thus the map $f : m \mapsto (\widehat{\mathfrak{h}}_m, \widehat{\Delta}^+_m, \widehat{\rho}_m, \widehat{\lambda}_m)$ is now a map from M to X. By construction, $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$, $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$, $\widehat{\Delta}^+$, $\widehat{\rho}$, $\widehat{\lambda}$ and $\widehat{\mathsf{D}}$ are the pullback by f of $\mathcal{G}$, $\mathfrak{h}$, Δ^+, ρ, λ and D. Thus $(\widehat{h}, \widehat{\Delta}^+, \widehat{\rho}, \widehat{\lambda})$ is parallel both for $\widehat{\nabla}$ and $f^*\nabla$. Since the stabiliser in $\mathfrak{g}$ of $(\mathfrak{h}, \Delta^+, \rho, \lambda)$ is $\mathfrak{t}$,

$$f^*(\omega) - \widehat{\omega} = \widehat{\nabla} - f^*\nabla \in \Omega^1(M, \mathfrak{t}).$$

However by Hypothesis (43) and Equation (41),

$$f^*(\omega) - \widehat{\omega} \in \Omega^1(M, \mathfrak{t}^\perp).$$

Thus $f^*(\omega) = \widehat{\omega}$. Then $f^*\nabla = \widehat{\nabla}$ and the proof of the proposition is completed. □

4.2.3. *The real structure on the space of Hitchin–Kostant quadruples.* Since T is a subgroup of G_0, it follows that each leaf of the foliation by right G_0-orbits of G is invariant by the action of T, thus giving rise to a foliation $\mathbf{F}$ of G/T whose leaves are all isomorphic to G_0/T. Since this foliation is left invariant by the action of G, it gives a foliation, that we also denote $\mathbf{F}$ on X. Since λ preserves $\mathfrak{t}$ and thus $\mathfrak{t}^\perp$, we obtain a *real structure* $v \to \overline{v}$ on X by setting

$$\omega(\overline{v}) = \lambda(\omega(v)).$$

One then immediately have

Proposition 4.2.6. *The tangent distribution $\mathsf{T}\mathbf{F}$ of the foliation $\mathbf{F}$ is given by*

$$\mathsf{T}\mathbf{F} := \{u \in \mathsf{T}\mathsf{X} \mid \overline{u} = u\}.$$

Proof. Indeed, $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is the set of fixed points of λ in $\mathfrak{g}$. □

4.2.4. *The space of Hitchin–Kostant quadruples and the symmetric space.* The map $p : (\mathfrak{h}, \rho, \lambda) \mapsto \rho$ defines a natural G equivariant projection p from the space X of Hitchin–Kostant quadruples to the symmetric space $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$. The fibres of this projection are described as follows. Since T is a subgroup of the maximal compact K, each leaf of the foliation by the right K-orbits on G is invariant by T, thus giving rise to a foliation on G/T. This foliation is invariant under the left G-action and thus gives a foliation $\mathbf{K}$ on X. The leaves of $\mathbf{K}$ are precisely the fibres of the projections p from X to $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$.

We should remark that the construction of the Maurer–Cartan form holds any homogeneous G-space with a reductive stabiliser, in particular for the symmetric space $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$ as we already did at the end of Section 2.4. In particular, one gets

Proposition 4.2.7. *The canonical $\mathfrak{g}$-bundle $\mathcal{G}$ over $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$ identifies with $\mathsf{T}_{\mathbb{C}}\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$. Let then i be the associated injection of $\mathsf{TS}(G) \to \mathcal{G}$. Then if α is the identity map of $\mathsf{TS}(\mathsf{G})$ seen as an element of $\Omega^1(\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G}), \mathsf{TS}(\mathsf{G}))$, then*

- *$i \circ \alpha$ is the Maurer–Cartan form of $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$,*
- *Moreover $p^*(i \circ \alpha) = \frac{1}{2}(\omega + \rho(\omega))$.*

Proof. Let us just prove the second assertion. In general, if H and L are reductive subgroups of a semi simple group G with $\mathsf{H} \subset \mathsf{L}$, ω_H and ω_L the respective Maurer–Cartan forms on G/H, G/L, if p is the projection $\mathsf{G}/\mathsf{H} \to \mathsf{G}/\mathsf{L}$ and π the projection from $\mathfrak{g}^\perp$ to $\mathfrak{l}^\perp$, then $p^*(\omega_L) = \pi \circ \omega_H$. This proves the second assertion. □

4.3. **The cyclic decomposition of the Maurer-Cartan form.** Let ω be the Maurer–Cartan on X as in Definition 4.2.2 with value in the bundle $\mathcal{G}$. We use the decomposition (40) to write

$$\omega = \omega_0 + \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta} \omega_\alpha, \text{ with } \omega_\alpha \in \Omega^1(\mathsf{X}, \mathcal{G}_\alpha),\ \omega_0 \in \Omega^1(\mathsf{X}, \mathcal{H}) \tag{44}$$

Actually, one has by Equation (41) that

$$\omega_0 \in \Omega^1(\mathsf{X}, \mathcal{H}_0). \tag{45}$$

From Equation (42) and since R^∇ takes values in $\mathfrak{t}$, we obtain that for all $\alpha \neq 0$,

$$-\,\mathrm{d}^\nabla \omega_\alpha = 2\omega_0 \wedge \omega_\alpha + \sum_{\substack{\beta,\gamma \in \Delta \\ \beta+\gamma=\alpha}} \omega_\beta \wedge \omega_\gamma. \tag{46}$$

We consider the following projections (whose pairwise products are zero) coming from the projection on the Lie algebra defined in equations (18) and that we denote by the same symbol by a slight abuse of notations.

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0 &: \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{H}, \\ \pi &: \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{G}_Z := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in Z} \mathcal{G}_\alpha, \\ \pi^\dagger &: \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{G}_{Z^\dagger} := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in Z^\dagger} \mathcal{G}_\alpha, \\ \pi_1 &: \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{G}_1 := \bigoplus_{\alpha \notin Z \cup Z^\dagger} \mathcal{G}_\alpha. \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Observe that

$$\pi + \pi^\dagger + \pi_0 + \pi_1 = 1.$$

Obviously, Proposition 2.2.2 extends word for word for the various brackets of the vector subbundles described in the equations (47).

Definition 4.3.1. *The* cyclic decomposition *of the Maurer–Cartan form ω is*

$$\omega = \omega_0 + \omega_1 + \phi + \phi^\dagger, \tag{48}$$

where $\omega_0 = \pi_0(\omega)$, $\omega_1 = \pi_1(\omega)$, $\phi = \pi(\omega)$ and $\phi^\dagger = \pi_\dagger(\omega)$.

We will use the following

Proposition 4.3.2. *Let ω be any 1-form on X with values in $\mathcal{G}$, then*

$$\pi_0(\omega\wedge\omega) = 2\,\phi\wedge\phi^\dagger + \pi_0(\omega_1\wedge\omega_1), \tag{49}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_1(\omega\wedge\omega) &= 2\,\pi_1(\omega_0\wedge\omega_1 + \omega_1\wedge\phi + \omega_1\wedge\phi^\dagger)\\ &\quad + \pi_1(\omega_1\wedge\omega_1 + \phi\wedge\phi + \phi^\dagger\wedge\phi^\dagger).\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(\omega\wedge\omega) &= 2\,\omega_0\wedge\phi + 2\,\pi(\omega_1\wedge\phi^\dagger)\\ &\quad + \pi(\phi^\dagger\wedge\phi^\dagger) + \pi(\omega_1\wedge\omega_1).\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Proof. Let us consider the cyclic decomposition

$$\omega = \omega_0 + \omega_1 + \phi + \phi^\dagger. \tag{52}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\omega\wedge\omega = {}& \omega_0\wedge\omega_0 + \omega_1\wedge\omega_1 + \phi\wedge\phi + \phi^\dagger\wedge\phi^\dagger\\ &+ 2\omega_0\wedge\omega_1 + 2\omega_0\wedge\phi + 2\omega_0\wedge\phi^\dagger\\ &+ 2\omega_1\wedge\phi + 2\omega_1\wedge\phi^\dagger\\ &+ 2\phi\wedge\phi^\dagger.\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

According to Proposition 2.2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_0(\phi\wedge\phi) = \pi_0(\phi^\dagger\wedge\phi^\dagger) = 0,\\ \pi_0(\phi\wedge\omega_1) = \pi_0(\phi^\dagger\wedge\omega_1) = 0,\\ \pi_0(\phi\wedge\phi^\dagger) = \phi\wedge\phi^\dagger.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, using the fact that $\mathfrak{h}$ is commutative, and normalises $\mathcal{G}_1$, $\mathcal{G}_Z$ and $\mathcal{G}_{Z^\dagger}$ we get Equation (49). We use again Proposition 2.2.2 to get that

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_1(\omega_0\wedge\omega_0) = 0, \quad \pi_1(\omega_0\wedge\phi) = 0,\\ \pi_1(\phi\wedge\phi^\dagger) = 0, \quad \pi_1(\omega_0\wedge\phi^\dagger) = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_1(\omega\wedge\omega) &= 2\,\pi_1(\omega_0\wedge\omega_1 + \omega_1\wedge\phi + \omega_1\wedge\phi^\dagger)\\ &\quad + \pi_1(\omega_1\wedge\omega_1 + \phi\wedge\phi + \phi^\dagger\wedge\phi^\dagger).\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

Then finally, by Proposition 2.2.2 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(\omega_0\wedge\omega_0) = 0, \quad \pi(\omega_0\wedge\omega_1) = 0,\\ \pi(\omega_0\wedge\phi^\dagger) = 0, \quad \pi(\phi\wedge\phi) = 0,\\ \pi(\omega_1\wedge\phi) = 0, \ \pi(\phi\wedge\phi^\dagger) = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Thus

$$\pi(\omega\wedge\omega) = 2\pi(\omega_0\wedge\phi) + 2\pi(\omega_1\wedge\phi^\dagger) + \pi(\omega_1\wedge\omega_1) + \pi(\phi^\dagger\wedge\phi^\dagger) \tag{57}$$

The proof of the proposition is completed. □

5. Higgs bundles and Hitchin theory

In this section, we will recall the definition of a Higgs bundle and sketch some of Hitchin theory. Higgs bundles have been studied extensively by many authors. The special case of $\mathsf{Sp}(4,\mathbb{R})$ has been in particular studied by Bradlow, García-Prada, Gothen and Mundet i Riera in [19], [9] and $\mathsf{Sp}(2n,\mathbb{R})$ in [18].

5.1. **Higgs bundles and the self duality equations.** We recall some definition and results from Hitchin [25]. We recall that a *Higgs (adjoint) bundle* over a Riemann surface Σ, is a pair $E = (\widehat{\mathcal{G}}, \Phi)$ where

(1) $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ is a holomorphic Lie algebra bundle over Σ,
(2) The *Higgs field* Φ is a holomorphic section of $\widehat{\mathcal{G}} \otimes K$, where K is the canonical bundle of Σ.

Let ∇ be a connection on $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ compatible with the holomorphic structure and $\widehat{\rho}$ a section of the bundle of antilinear automorphisms of $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ such that the restriction to every fibre is a Cartan involution with respect to a maximal compact. Let $\Phi^* = -\widehat{\rho}(\Phi)$, and R^∇ the curvature of ∇. We say that $(\nabla, \widehat{\rho})$ is a *solution the self duality equations* if

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla\widehat{\rho} &= 0, \\ \mathrm{d}^\nabla\Phi = 0, \;\; \mathrm{d}^\nabla\Phi^* &= 0 \\ R^\nabla &= 2\,\Phi \wedge \Phi^*. \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

The last three equations are equivalent to the fact that $\nabla + \Phi + \Phi^*$ is flat and the curvature of ∇ is of type $(1,1)$. Observe also that $\widehat{\rho}$ and the holomorphic structure totally determines ∇: by the first and last equation in (58), ∇ is the Chern connection of the Hermitian bundle $(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}, \widehat{\rho})$.

Given a Higgs bundle $E = (\widehat{\mathcal{G}}, \Phi)$ for which there exists a solution of the self duality equations, over a closed Riemann surface Σ, let $(\nabla, \widehat{\rho})$ be the solution of the self duality equations. The *representation associated to the Higgs bundle* E is the monodromy of the flat connection $\nabla + \Phi + \Phi^*$.

The *Hopf differential* of the Higgs bundle is the quadratic holomorphic differential $\langle \Phi | \Phi \rangle$ where $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ denotes the Killing form. From [15], solutions of the self duality equation are interpreted as equivariant harmonic mappings. Those harmonic mappings for which the Hopf differential vanishes are conformal harmonic mappings, or in other words branched minimal immersions [24].

5.2. **The Hitchin section.** Let us now recall the construction by Hitchin [26] of Higgs bundles from holomorphic differentials, using the notation of our preliminary paragraph. Let Σ be a closed surface. Given a complex Lie group G. We choose a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ and an $\mathfrak{h}$-principal Lie algebra $\mathfrak{s}$ generated by (X, a, Y) as in Section 2.3. Let $m_1, \dots, m_\ell$ are the exponents of G. Let e_i be an element of $S^{2m_i}(V)$ of highest weight with respect to the action of the principal Lie algebra generated by (X, a, Y).

Let us also write the decomposition under the grading by the element a as

$$\mathfrak{g} := \bigoplus_{i=-m_\ell}^{i=m_\ell}, \tag{59}$$

where $\mathfrak{g}^{(m)} := \{u \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [a, u] = m \cdot u\}$. Observe that $e_i \in \mathfrak{g}_{m_i}$ and

$$Y \in \mathfrak{g}_{-1} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Pi} \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}. \tag{60}$$

Moreover $\mathfrak{g}^{(0)} = \mathfrak{h}$ is the centraliser of a. Let us now consider the Lie algebra bundle

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}} := \bigoplus_{i=-m_\ell}^{i=m_\ell} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}^{(m)}, \tag{61}$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}^{(m)} := \mathfrak{g}^{(m)} \otimes \mathcal{K}^m$ and $\mathcal{K}$ is the canonical bundle of Σ. We write $\widehat{\mathcal{H}} =: \widehat{\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} = \mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathcal{K}^0$. The fibre of $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ is a Cartan subalgebra equipped with a choice of positive roots (given by the element a). We then denote by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}} := \widehat{\mathcal{H}} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_\alpha,$$

the corresponding root space decomposition where $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_\alpha$ is the eigenspace associated to the root α.

The *Hitchin section* then associates to a family of holomorphic differentials $\mathrm{q} := (q_1, \dots, q_\ell)$ where q_i is of degree $m_i + 1$ the Higgs bundle $H(\mathrm{q}) := (\widehat{\mathcal{G}}, \Phi_q)$ where

$$\Phi_\mathrm{q} := Y + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} e_i \otimes q_i \in H^0(\Sigma, \widehat{\mathcal{G}} \otimes K). \tag{62}$$

Observe that $[\mathfrak{g}^{(m)}, \mathfrak{g}^{(m')}] \subset \mathfrak{g}^{(m+m')}$ and thus the Lie algebra structure on $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ is well defined.

By Section 5 of [26] based on Theorem 7 of [32], we have

Proposition 5.2.1. *There exist homogeneous invariant polynomials p_i on $\mathfrak{g}$ of degree $m_i + 1$ such that $p_i(\Phi_\mathrm{q}) = q_i$.*

Observe also that

$$\widehat{\sigma}(\Phi_\mathrm{q}) = -\Phi_\mathrm{q} \tag{63}$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}$ is the unique involution (holomorphic) associated to $\mathfrak{s}$ by Proposition 2.5.6. Hitchin then proved in [26].

Theorem 5.2.2. [Hitchin] *The self duality equations associated to the Higgs bundle $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{q})$ admit a unique solution $(\nabla, \widehat{\rho})$. Moreover $\nabla\widehat{\sigma} = 0$. In particular the monodromy is with values in G_0. Finally if $\mathrm{q} = 0$, then the monodromy is with values in the principal SL_2 and is the uniformisation of the underlying Riemann surface.*

The first assertion uses more general results of Hitchin and Simpson [25], [46]. The second assertion follows at once from the uniqueness of the solutions of the self duality equations. Also since $\Phi(\mathrm{q})$ is injective it immediately follows that the harmonic mappings associated to the Higgs bundles $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{q})$ are immersions (See [43] for details).

5.2.1. *Hitchin component.* Finally, Hitchin proved

Theorem 5.2.3. [Hitchin] *Given a Riemann surface Σ, the map which associates to q the monodromy associated to the Higgs bundle $H(\mathrm{q})$ is a parametrisation of a connected component $\mathcal{H}(\Sigma, \mathsf{G}_0)$ of the character variety of representations from $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ to G_0.*

The case of $\mathsf{G}_0 = \mathsf{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ had been treated independently by M. Wolf in [47], where he directly considered the quadratic differential as the Hopf differential of the harmonic mapping. The connected component $\mathcal{H}(\Sigma, \mathsf{G}_0)$ is now called the *Hitchin component* and its elements are *Hitchin representations*. The *Fuchsian locus*, is the subset of *Fuchsian representations*, that is those representations that are discrete faithful and with values in a principal SL_2. By [34] and [17] Hitchin representations are discrete faithful.

5.3. **Cyclic Higgs bundles.** A *cyclic Higgs bundle* is by definition the image $H(\mathrm{q})$ by the Hitchin section of a family of holomorphic differential $\mathrm{q} := (q_1, \dots, q_\ell)$ where $q_i = 0$ when $i \neq \ell$. The corresponding Higgs Field Φ_q is called *cyclic*. Cyclic Higgs bundles were studied by Baraglia in [3] in relation with the affine Toda lattice.

It follows immediately from the construction that

Proposition 5.3.1. *For a cyclic Higgs field Φ_q, we have*

$$\Phi_\mathrm{q} \in \Omega^1\left(\Sigma, \bigoplus_{\alpha\in Z} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_\alpha\right). \tag{64}$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.3.5, $e_\ell \in \mathfrak{g}_\eta$. By Equation (60)

$$Y \in \mathcal{G}_{-1} \otimes K = \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Pi} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{-\alpha} \otimes K\right).$$

The proposition follows. □

The following is implicit in Baraglia's paper [3] but not stated as such. We write the proof using arguments borrowed from this article. Similar results are found in [13].

Proposition 5.3.2. [Baraglia] *Let $(\nabla, \widehat{\rho})$ be the solution of the self duality equation associated to a cyclic Higgs bundle $(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}, \Phi_\mathrm{q})$. Then $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ is parallel under ∇ and globally invariant by $\widehat{\rho}$.*

Proof. Let ζ be a primitive $(m_\ell + 1)$-th root of unity. Let ψ be the section of the bundle of automorphisms of $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ whose restriction to $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}^{(m)}$ is the multiplication by ζ^m. Observe now that

$$\psi(\Phi_\mathrm{q}) = \zeta^{-1}\Phi_\mathrm{q}.$$

It follows that $(\nabla, \widehat{\rho})$, being also a solution of Hitchin equation for $(E, \zeta^{-1}\,\Phi_\mathrm{q})$ is then a solution for $(E, \psi(\Phi_\mathrm{q}))$. It follows that

$$\psi^*\nabla = \nabla,$$

and thus ψ is parallel for ∇ and, in particular, so is $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ which is the centralizer of ψ. Similarly, we obtain that ψ anticommutes with $\widehat{\rho}$. Thus $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ which is the centralizer of ψ is globally preserved by $\widehat{\rho}$. □

5.4. **Harmonic mappings and Higgs bundles.** We recall the following facts relating equivariant harmonic mappings and Higgs bundles (see [15] in the case of $\mathsf{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$). Let as usual G be a complex Lie group, and the bundle $\mathcal{G}$, form $\omega \in \Omega^1(\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G}), \mathcal{G})$ and $\rho \in \Gamma(\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{G}))$ as defined in paragraph 2.4.2.

Recall that given a Riemannian manifold M and a representation δ of $\pi_1(M)$ in G, a *ρ-equivariant map* F from M to $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$, is a map $\tilde{F}$ from the universal cover $\tilde{M}$ of M, with values in $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$ so that $\tilde{F}(\gamma \cdot x) = \rho(\gamma) \cdot \tilde{F}(x)$, where $\gamma \in \pi_1(M)$. Then

the energy density of $\tilde{F}$ is $\pi_1(M)$-invariant and thus give rises to a function $e(F)$ on M also called the *energy density* of F.

Theorem 5.4.1. *Let f be an harmonic mapping from a Riemann surface S in $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$, then $(f^*(\mathcal{G}), (f^*\omega)^{(1,0)})$ is a Higgs bundle. Moreover $f^*(\rho)$ satisfies the self duality equations. Conversely, let S be a simply connected Riemann surface, (E,Φ) a Higgs bundle and ρ_E a solution of the self-duality equations. Then there exists an harmonic mapping f from S to $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$ unique up to the action of G so that*

$$(E,\Phi,\rho_E) = (f^*\mathcal{G}, (f^*\omega)^{(1,0)}, f^*\rho).$$

Moreover using the notation of paragraph 4.1, we have

Proposition 5.4.2. *Let S be a Riemannian surface equipped with the area form $\mathrm{d}\mu$. Let f from S to $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$ be an equivariant harmonic mapping. Let $e(f)$ be the energy density on S, then*

$$\mathrm{Energy}(f) := \frac{1}{2}\int_S e(f)\,\mathrm{d}\mu = i\int_S \langle (f^*\omega)^{(1,0)} | (f^*\omega)^{(0,1)}\rangle.$$

Proof. We have that

$$e(f)\,\mathrm{d}\mu = -\langle f^*\omega | f^*\omega \circ J\rangle = 2i\,\langle (f^*\omega)^{(1,0)} | (f^*\omega)^{(0,1)}\rangle.$$

□

6. Cyclic surfaces

We interpret the Cartan involution ρ as the real structure on $\mathfrak{g}$ coming from the complexification of $\mathfrak{k}$. Let also σ be the involution constructed in Section 2.5. Let finally $\lambda = \sigma\circ\rho$ be the real structure on $\mathfrak{g}$ coming from the complexification of $\mathfrak{g}_0$. We will use in this section the decomposition (48).

Definition 6.0.3. [cyclic maps] *A map f from a surface Σ to X is* cyclic *if*

(1) $f^*(\omega_1) = 0$,
(2) $f^*(\omega_0) = 0$,
(3) $f^*(\phi\wedge\phi) = 0$,
(4) $f^*\left(\rho(\phi)\right) = -f^*(\phi^\dagger)$,
(5) if β is a simple root, $f^*(\omega_\beta)$ never vanishes,
(6) $f^*\left(\lambda(\omega)\right) = f^*\left(\omega\right)$.

The notion of cyclic surfaces is cousin to that of τ-maps studied in [6]. However, the latter notion is defined in the context of compact Lie groups.

We have

Proposition 6.0.4. *Assertion (3) is equivalent to: for all β and α in Z, we have*

$$f^*(\omega_\alpha\wedge\omega_\beta) = 0. \tag{65}$$

Proof. We begin with an observation on cyclic roots. Let $\alpha_i \in Z$, and assume that $\alpha_0+\alpha_1 = \alpha_2+\alpha_3$ is a root. Then $\{\alpha_0,\alpha_1\} = \{\alpha_2,\alpha_3\}$. Indeed, if all roots α_i are simple, this follows from the fact that simple roots form a free system. If one of the α_i – say α_0, is $-\eta$ then α_1 is simple and $\alpha_0+\alpha_1$ is negative. From it follows that either α_2 or α_3 is $-\eta$. Thus $\{\alpha_0,\alpha_1\} = \{\alpha_2,\alpha_3\}$.

From this we deduce that $f^*(\phi\wedge\phi) = 0$ implies that for all α and β in Z, then $f^*(\omega_\alpha\wedge\omega_\beta) = 0$. Indeed $f^*(\omega_\alpha\wedge\omega_\beta)$ is zero if $\gamma = \alpha+\beta$ is a not root and otherwise takes values in $\mathcal{G}_\gamma$.

□

6.0.1. *The reality condition.* Let G_0 be the split real form associated to the Cartan subalgebra and its system of positive roots .

Proposition 6.0.5. *Assume that $f : \Sigma \to X$ is a cyclic surface. Then the image of Σ lies in a G_0-orbit in X.*

Proof. By Assertion (6) $f^*(\lambda(\omega)) = f^*(\omega)$. In other words $\overline{\mathsf{T}f(u)} = \mathsf{T}f(u)$ for all u in S. Thus by Proposition 4.2.6, $f(\Sigma)$ is tangent to the foliation $\mathbf{F}$ defined by the "right" G_0-orbits. □

6.0.2. *First example: the Fuchsian case.* Let $x = (\mathfrak{h}, \rho, \lambda)$ be a point in X. Let S be the principal SL_2 in G_0 associated to x. By definition, the *Fuchsian surface* though x is the orbit of S. This gives our first examples of cyclic surfaces.

Proposition 6.0.6. *If S is a Fuchsian surface in X, then S is a cyclic surface such that $\omega_\eta|_S = 0$.*

Proof. By construction, the Lie algebra of the complexification of S is generated by (a, X, Y), where

$$a = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha\in\Delta^+} \mathrm{h}_\alpha = \sum_{\alpha\in\Pi} r_\alpha \,\mathrm{h}_\alpha,$$
$$X = \sum_{\alpha\in\Pi} \sqrt{r_\alpha}\mathrm{x}_\alpha,\ Y = \sum_{\alpha\in\Pi} \sqrt{r_\alpha}\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha}.$$

Thus, by Proposition 2.5.5, the Lie algebra of S is generated by $X - Y, iX + iY, ia$. Since ia belongs to $\mathfrak{h}$ and generates a compact subgroup, $ia \in \mathfrak{t}$.

Therefore, the orbit of S in X is with values in the complex 2-dimensional distribution $\mathcal{W}$ such that $\mathcal{V} := \omega(\mathcal{W})$ is generated by $X - Y, iX + iY$. Moreover, since S is real, the orbit of S in X is tangent to the real 2-dimensional distribution $\mathcal{W}_0$ such that

$$\omega(\mathcal{W}_0) := \{u \in \mathcal{V} \mid \lambda(u) = u\} =: \mathcal{V}_0.$$

In particular, we now observe that

$$\mathcal{V}_0 \subset \mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{Q} := \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Pi} \mathcal{G}_\alpha \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Pi} \mathcal{G}_{-\alpha} \subset \mathcal{G}_Z \oplus \mathcal{G}_{Z^\dagger}.$$

Observe that $\mathcal{V}$ is fixed pointwise by $-\rho$, thus if ϕ and $\phi^\dagger$ is the projection from $\mathcal{V}$ to $\mathcal{G}_Z$ and $\mathcal{G}_{Z^\dagger}$ respectively, $-\rho(\phi) = \phi^\dagger$. Thus a Fuchsian surface is a cyclic surface on which ω_η vanishes. □

6.1. **From cyclic surfaces to Higgs bundles.** We emphasise that the result of the next paragraph is local: the surface Σ is not assumed to be closed. For a cyclic map f from Σ to X, we write $\Phi = f^*\phi$, $\Phi^\dagger = f^*\phi^\dagger$. We denote by $\widehat{\rho}$ the pullback of ρ on $f^*\mathcal{G}$. By the definition of cyclic maps $\Phi^\dagger = -\widehat{\rho}(\Phi) = \Phi^*$. We also denote by $\widehat{\nabla}$ the induced connection $f^*\nabla$ on $f^*\mathcal{G}$

Proposition 6.1.1. *Let f be a cyclic map from Σ to X. Then*

1. *there exists a unique complex structure on the surface so that Φ is of type $(1,0)$ and $\Phi^\dagger$ is of type $(0,1)$.*
2. *the data $\Psi = (f^*\mathcal{G}, \Phi)$ defines a Higgs bundle whose Hopf differential is zero.*

(3) The pair $(\widehat{\nabla}, \widehat{\rho})$ on $f^*\mathcal{G}$ is the solution of the self duality equations:

$$\widehat{\nabla}\widehat{\rho} = 0, \tag{66}$$

$$R^{\widehat{\nabla}} = 2\,\Phi \wedge \Phi^*, \tag{67}$$

$$\mathrm{d}^{\widehat{\nabla}}\Phi = 0, \tag{68}$$

$$\mathrm{d}^{\widehat{\nabla}}\Phi^* = 0. \tag{69}$$

(4) Finally, if H is the Hitchin map from the space of Higgs bundles to the space of holomorphic differentials, then $H(\Psi)$ is a holomorphic differential of highest possible degree.

As a corollary, we get

Corollary 6.1.2. *Let f be a cyclic map. Let p be the projection from X to the symmetric space $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$, then $p \circ f$ is a minimal surface. Moreover*

$$\mathrm{Area}(p \circ f) = i \int_S \langle \Phi | \Phi^\dagger \rangle \tag{70}$$

Proof of Proposition 6.1.1. Since $f^*\omega_\alpha$ never vanishes for any simple root α, it follows that there exists exactly one complex J_α structure so that $f^*\omega_\alpha$ is of type $(1,0)$. We also know by Proposition 6.0.4 that $f^*\omega_\alpha \wedge f^*\omega_\beta = 0$ for all pairs α and β of simple roots. If α and β are simple and $\alpha + \beta$ is a root, it follows from the fact that both $f^*\alpha$ and $f^*\beta$ are isomorphisms that $J_\alpha = J_\beta$. Then using the connectedness of the Dynkin diagram we get that for all pairs α and β, $J_\alpha = J_\beta$. This proves the uniqueness and shows that there exists a complex structure such that for all simple root α, $f^*\omega_\alpha$ is of type $(1,0)$. It remains to understand the type of $f^*\omega_{-\eta}$.

Since $f^*\phi \wedge f^*\phi = 0$, decomposing along roots we obtain that for all simple root α,

$$f^*\omega_\alpha \wedge f^*\omega_{-\eta} = 0 \tag{71}$$

Since there exist a simple root α so that $\eta - \alpha$ is a root and in particular

$$[\mathcal{G}_\alpha, \mathcal{G}_{-\eta}] \neq 0.$$

Equation (71) implies that $f^*(\omega_{-\eta})$ is of type $(1,0)$. We thus obtain that Φ is of type $(1,0)$ and by the reality condition that

$$\Phi^\dagger = \Phi^*,$$

is of type $(0,1)$. This finishes the proof of statement (1). Statement (2) is just an immediate consequence of the previous statement.

Let us now prove statement (3). Let f be a cyclic map. Recall that for a cyclic surface

$$f^*(\omega \wedge \omega) = (\Phi + \Phi^*) \wedge (\Phi + \Phi^*) = 2\,\Phi \wedge \Phi^* \in \Omega^2(\Sigma, \widehat{\mathcal{H}}). \tag{72}$$

Thus the curvature equation (42)

$$R^{\widehat{\nabla}} + \mathrm{d}^{\widehat{\nabla}}\Phi + \mathrm{d}^{\widehat{\nabla}}\Phi^\dagger + 2\,\Phi \wedge \Phi^\dagger = 0,$$

yields the self duality field equation by taking the projections, namely π_0 for the first equation and π and $\pi^\dagger$ for the two last equations:

$$R^{\widehat{\nabla}} + 2\,\Phi \wedge \Phi^* = 0,$$
$$\mathrm{d}^{\widehat{\nabla}}\Phi = 0, \quad \mathrm{d}^{\widehat{\nabla}}\Phi^* = 0.$$

Finally, statement (4) follows from Hitchin's construction in Section 5 of [26] (see also Baraglia [3]) and Proposition 5.2.1.

□

Proof of Corollary 6.1.2. For a smooth map $g : M \to N$ between manifolds, we consider $\mathsf{T}g$ as an element of $\Omega^1(M, g^*(\mathsf{T}N))$. From Proposition 4.2.7, $\mathsf{T}_{\mathbb{C}}\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$ is identified with the canonical $\mathfrak{g}$ bundle over $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G})$. As a consequence of the second assertion of Proposition 4.2.7, we have

$$\frac{1}{2}(\Phi + \Phi^*) = \mathsf{T}_{\mathbb{C}}(p \circ f),$$

and thus

$$\mathsf{T}^{(1,0)}_{\mathbb{C}}(p \circ f) = \frac{1}{2}\Phi, \quad \mathsf{T}^{(0,1)}_{\mathbb{C}}(p \circ f) = \frac{1}{2}\Phi^*.$$

Now the equation $\overline{\partial}\Phi = 0$ says that $p \circ f$ is harmonic (See [15] and Proposition 8.1.2. of [36]). Moreover by the last assertion of the Proposition 6.1.1, the Hopf differential of f is zero and thus $p \circ f$ is a minimal mapping (See Proposition 8.1.4 of [36]). Equation (70) follows at once from Proposition 5.4.2 and the fact that the energy of a minimal mapping is the area. □

6.2. **From cyclic Higgs bundles to cyclic surfaces.** In this section, contrarily to the previous section, where the construction was purely local, the surface is now assumed to be closed. The main result of this section is

Theorem 6.2.1. *Let $(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}, \Phi_{\mathrm{q}})$ be a cyclic Higgs bundle over a closed surface Σ. Then there exists a unique cyclic map f from Σ to X such that*

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}} = f^*(\mathcal{G})$$
$$\Phi_{\mathrm{q}} = f^*(\phi). \tag{73}$$

Proof. Let $(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}, \Phi_{\mathrm{q}})$ be a cyclic Higgs bundle. Let $(\nabla, \widehat{\rho})$ be the solution of the self duality equations. By Proposition 5.3.2, the corresponding vector bundle $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ is parallel. Thus, following Hitchin Theorem 5.2.2, the associated involution $\widehat{\sigma}$ is parallel. Thus the Hitchin–Kostant quadruple $(\widehat{\mathcal{H}}, \widehat{\Delta}^+, \widehat{\rho}, \widehat{\lambda})$ is parallel. Observe now that by Proposition 5.3.1,

$$\Omega := \Phi_{\mathrm{q}} + \Phi_{\mathrm{q}}^* \in \Omega^1\left(\Sigma, f^*\left(\mathcal{G}_Z\right) \oplus f^*\left(\mathcal{G}_{Z^\dagger}\right)\right).$$

In particular

$$\forall u \in \widehat{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \widehat{\rho}(u) = \widehat{\sigma}(u) = u \implies \langle u | \Omega \rangle = 0.$$

Recall finally that from the self duality equations $\nabla + \Omega$ is flat.

Thus we can apply Proposition 4.2.4, to obtain a map f from Σ to X so that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}} = f^*(\mathcal{G})$$
$$\Omega = f^*(\omega). \tag{74}$$

It remains to prove that f is cyclic. This follows at once from the following three facts

(1) By construction, we have that $\Phi_{\mathrm{q}} = f^*(\phi)$, $\Phi^*_{\mathrm{q}} = f^*(\phi^\dagger)$, $f^*\omega_0 = 0$, $f^*\omega_1 = 0$, and $f^*\omega_\alpha$ never vanishes for all simple roots.
(2) By Equation (63), $\sigma(\Phi_{\mathrm{q}}) = -\Phi_{\mathrm{q}}$ and since ρ commutes with σ, $\sigma(\Phi^*_{\mathrm{q}}) = -\Phi^*_{\mathrm{q}}$.
(3) Moreover $\Phi_{\mathrm{q}} \wedge \Phi_{\mathrm{q}}$ is of type $(2,0)$, hence vanishes.

We thus have verified Assertions (1), (2), (4), (5), (6) and (3) of the definition of cyclic surfaces. □

6.3. **Cyclic surfaces as holomorphic curves.** The purpose of this section to give another interpretation of cyclic surfaces as holomorphic cuves in some quotient of G_0.

We use the notation of the previous section. Let us revisit the definition of cyclic surfaces. Let us first consider the complex distributions in X given by $\mathcal{V}$ with $\omega(\mathcal{V}) = \mathcal{G}_Z$ with the complex structure J_0 given by the multiplication by i, as well as $\mathcal{V}^\dagger$ with $\omega(\mathcal{V}^\dagger) = \mathcal{G}_{Z^\dagger}$ with the complex structure J_0 given by the multiplication by $-i$. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be the complex distribution given by

$$\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{V}^\dagger.$$

Then the complex conjugation ρ becomes a complex involution of $\mathcal{W}$, and the Hitchin involution σ, preserving both $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{V}^\dagger$, is also an antilinear involution. We now consider the subdistribution

$$\mathcal{S} = \{u \in \mathcal{W} \mid \sigma(u) = -u, \quad \rho(u) = -u\}.$$

Observe that $\mathcal{S}$ is a subdistribution of TF (see Proposition 4.2.6). Then we have

Proposition 6.3.1. *A cyclic surface is a surface everywhere tangent to $\mathcal{S}$ and whose tangent space is complex. Conversely, a surface everywhere tangent to $\mathcal{S}$ and whose tangent space is complex is a cyclic surface.*

Proof. The proof is just linear algebra. If $\Sigma \hookrightarrow \mathsf{X}$ is a cyclic surface, then for all u tangent to Σ

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(u) &= \phi(u) + \phi^\dagger(u), \\ \lambda(\omega(u)) &= \omega(u), \\ \rho(\phi(u)) &= -\phi^\dagger(u). \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

It follows that a cyclic surface is tangent to $\mathcal{S}$. Let now J be the complex structure on Σ so that Φ is of type $(1,0)$. We obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(J \cdot u) &= \phi(J \cdot u) - \rho(\phi(J \cdot u)) \\ &= i\,\phi(u) - \rho(i\,\phi(u)) \\ &= i\,\phi(u) + i\,\rho(\phi(u)) \\ &= i\,\phi(u) - i\,\phi^\dagger(u) \\ &= J_0 \cdot \omega(u). \end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

In other words, $\mathsf{T}\Sigma$ is a complex subspace of $\mathcal{W}$.

Conversely, assume $\mathsf{T}\Sigma$ is a complex subspace of $\mathcal{W}$. Let us equip Σ with the induced complex structure. Then by construction, for all $u \in \mathsf{T}\Sigma$

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_1(u) &= \omega_0(u) = 0, \\ \lambda(u) &= u. \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

Since $\omega = \phi + \phi^\dagger$ is fixed by $-\rho$ which exchanges $\mathcal{G}_Z$ and $\mathcal{G}_{Z^\dagger}$, it follows that $\rho(\phi) = -\phi^\dagger$. Finally, since $\phi(J_0 u) = i\,\phi(u)$, it follows that $\phi \wedge \phi = 0$ on Σ. In particular, Σ is a cyclic surface. □

7. Infinitesimal rigidity

In this section, we prove the infinitesimal rigidity for closed cyclic surfaces. The important corollary for us is Theorem 1.5.1 that we restate here.

Theorem 7.0.2. *The map $\Psi : \mathcal{E}_{m_\ell+1} \to \mathcal{H}(\Sigma, \mathsf{G}_0)$ is an immersion.*

We exploit the fact that cyclic surfaces are solutions of a Pfaffian system, which means that a certain family of forms vanishes on them, as well as a reality condition.

After a preliminary section on Pfaffian systems, we define infinitesimal variation and state our main result, Proposition 7.3.2, in this language.

We prove Theorem 7.0.2 as the corollary of Proposition 7.3.2 (whose proof occupy most of the section) in Paragraph 7.3.4.

The proof of Proposition 7.3.2 occupy most of the sequel and proceeds through obtaining formulas for the derivatives of the infinitesimal variation and a Böchner type formula.

7.1. Preliminary: variation of Pfaffian systems.

In this section, totally independent on the rest, we explain a useful proposition that we shall use in the sequel of the proof.

We shall consider the following setting. Let $\mathcal{E}_i$ be vector bundles over a manifold M equipped with a connection ∇. Let $\Omega := (\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_n)$ be a family of forms Ω_i with values in $\mathcal{E}_i$.

Definition 7.1.1. *A submanifold N of M is* a solution of the Pfaffian system *defined by Ω if all i, Ω_i vanishes on N.*

From now on, by taking $\mathcal{E} = \bigoplus \mathcal{E}_i$, we may as well assume that all $\mathcal{E}_i$ are the same and equal to some vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$. If $\mathcal{E}$ is a trivial line bundle, so that Ω_i are ordinary forms, then we say the Pfaffian system is *elementary*. We can always reduce any system to an elementary one, by choosing a local trivialisation of $\mathcal{E}$ given by local sections (v_α), then the *associated elementary Pfaffian system* in the trivialisation is (Ω_i^α) where

$$\Omega_i = \sum_\alpha \Omega_i^\alpha\, v_\alpha. \tag{78}$$

7.1.1. *Deformation of Pfaffian systems.* Let $F = (f_t)$ be a 1-parameter smooth family of deformations of maps from N to M so that f_0 is the identity. Let

$$\xi = \left.\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\right|_{t=0} f_t. \tag{79}$$

Thus ξ is a vector field along N, called the *tangent vector to the family* (f_t). .

Definition 7.1.2. *The family* (f_t) *is a* first order deformation *of the Pfaffian solution* N *if, for all* i

$$\left.\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\right|_{t=0} f_t^*\Omega_i = 0, \tag{80}$$

where using ∇*, we have identified* $f_t^*(\mathcal{E})$ *with* $f_0^*(\mathcal{E})$ *for all* t*.*

We observe that the definition does not depend on the choice of ∇: indeed, equivalently, (f_t) is a first order deformation, if and only if it is a first order deformation for all elementary associated Pfaffian system in local trivialisation.

Let us introduce the following definition

Definition 7.1.3. *A vector field* ξ *along a solution of a Pfaffian system* $\Omega = (\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_n)$ *is* an infinitesimal variation fo the Pfaffian system *if for all* i

$$i_\xi \mathrm{d}^\nabla \Omega_i\big|_N = -\,\mathrm{d}^\nabla\left(i_\xi \Omega_i\right)\big|_N . \tag{81}$$

The following relates the two definitions and will be an important technical tool

Proposition 7.1.4. *Assume that* ξ *is a tangent vector to a family of first order deformation of the Pfaffian system. Then* ξ *is an infinitesimal variation of the Pfaffian system: for all* i*,*

$$i_\xi \mathrm{d}^\nabla \Omega_i\big|_N = -\,\mathrm{d}^\nabla\left(i_\xi \Omega_i\right)\big|_N . \tag{82}$$

Proof. It is enough to assume that $n = 1$, that is $\Omega = (\Omega)$. Assume first that ∇ is the trivial connection. We consider (f_t) as a map F from $P := N \times [0,1]$ to N. Let ∂_t be the canonical vector on P associated to the flow $\phi_t : (n, s) \mapsto (n, s + t)$. Let also J be the injection $n \mapsto (n, 0)$ from N into P. Let finally $\Theta = F^*\Omega$. Observe first that for any form α,

$$J^*(i_{\partial_t} F^*\alpha) = J^*(F^* i_{F_*\partial_t}\alpha) = J^*(F^*(i_\xi \alpha)) = f_0^*(i_\xi \alpha). \tag{83}$$

Since ξ is is a tangent vector to a family of first order deformation of the Pfaffian system, we have

$$J^*\Theta = 0, \qquad J^* L_{\partial_t}\Theta = 0. \tag{84}$$

By the Lie–Cartan formula,

$$L_{\partial_t}\Theta = \mathrm{d} i_{\partial_t}\Theta + i_{\partial_t}\mathrm{d}\Theta. \tag{85}$$

Using Equation (83), we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= J^*\mathrm{d} i_{\partial_t}\Theta + J^* i_{\partial_t}\mathrm{d}\Theta \\ &= J^*\mathrm{d} i_{\partial_t} F^*\Omega + J^* i_{\partial_t}\mathrm{d}F^*\Omega \\ &= f_0^*\left(\mathrm{d} i_{\partial_\xi}\Omega + i_{\partial_\xi}\mathrm{d}\Omega\right) \end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

Since f_0 is the identity, the last equation yields

$$0 = \mathrm{d} i_\xi \Omega + i_\xi \mathrm{d}\Omega. \tag{87}$$

Thus the conclusion of the proposition holds when ∇ is trivial. Assume now that ∇ is not trivial. Let $x_0 \in N$. We can find locally a base (v_α) of $\mathcal{E}$ giving a local trivialisation, such that $\nabla v_\alpha = 0$ at x_0. Let us write

$$\Theta = \sum_\alpha \Theta_\alpha\, v_\alpha. \tag{88}$$

Observe that N is also a solution of the Pfaffian system defined by (Θ_α) and that ξ is an infinitesimal deformation of that Pfaffian system. Thus, at x_0,

$$\begin{aligned} i_\xi \mathrm{d}^\nabla \Theta &= \sum_\alpha i_\xi \mathrm{d}\Theta_\alpha \, v_\alpha \\ &= -\sum_\alpha \mathrm{d}(i_\xi \Theta_\alpha)\, v_\alpha \\ &= -\mathrm{d}^\nabla (i_\xi \Theta), \end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

where in the first equality we used that $\nabla v_\alpha = 0$ at x_0, in the second we used Equation (81) for the Pfaffian system (Ω_α) and finally in the last equality we used $\nabla v_\alpha = 0$ at x_0 again. □

The careful reader could check that Equation (81) is independent of the choice of ∇ if Ω vanishes along N.

7.2. **Cyclic surfaces as solutions of a Pfaffian system.**

Definition 7.2.1. *The* cyclic Pfaffian system *is the family of forms*

$$\Lambda := (\omega_0, \omega_1, \phi \wedge \phi, \phi + \rho(\phi^\dagger)).$$

By definition a cyclic surface is a solution of the Pfaffian system Λ. Observe that for a solution of the Pfaffian system Λ, $\phi^\dagger \wedge \phi^\dagger$ also vanishes. Another form vanishes for cyclic surfaces: let $\mathcal{H}_0$ be the orthogonal in $\mathcal{H}$ with respect to ρ of the subdistribution $\mathcal{T}$ corresponding to the Lie algebra of T. We have the orthogonal decomposition

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{T} \oplus \mathcal{H}_0.$$

We can thus write

$$\pi_0 = \pi_t + \check{\pi}_0.$$

where $\check{\pi}_0$ and π_t are the orthogonal projections respectively on $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{T}$. Since $\check{\pi}_0\left(R^\nabla\right) = 0$, it follows from the self duality equations (67) that $\check{\pi}_0(\phi \wedge \phi^\dagger)|_\Sigma = 0$.

7.3. **Infinitesimal deformation of cyclic surfaces.**

Let ξ be a vector field along a cyclic surface f.

Definition 7.3.1. *We say ξ is an* infinitesimal deformation of cyclic surfaces*, if ξ is an infinitesimal deformation of the cyclic Pfaffian system and if ξ is* real*, that is $\overline{\xi} = \xi$. We say ξ is an* infinitesimal deformation of closed cyclic surfaces*, if furthermore the underlying surface is closed.*

In the rest of this section, ξ will be a fixed infinitesimal variation of cyclic surfaces. We will also consider, for the sake of simplicity, the surface Σ as a submanifold of X, statement which is locally true. The following is our main result.

Proposition 7.3.2. *Let ξ be an infinitesimal deformation of a closed cyclic surface. Assume that there exists a simple root such that $\omega_\alpha(\xi) = 0$, then $\xi = 0$.*

In this proposition, ω_α is defined in decomposition (44).

7.3.1. *The cyclic decomposition of an infinitesimal deformation.* The cyclic decomposition of ξ is given by

$$i_\xi\omega = \zeta_0 + \zeta_1 + \zeta + \zeta^\dagger \tag{90}$$

where

$$\zeta_0 := i_\xi\omega_0 \in \mathcal{H} \quad \zeta_1 := i_\xi\omega_1 \in \mathcal{G}_1,$$
$$\zeta := i_\xi\phi \in \mathcal{G}_Z, \quad \zeta^\dagger := i_\xi\phi^\dagger \in \mathcal{G}_{Z^\dagger}.$$

Equation (45) implies that actually

$$\zeta_0 \in \mathcal{H}_0. \tag{91}$$

7.3.2. *Reality condition.* We assume that ξ is a real vector, meaning that $\overline{\xi} = \xi$, that is by definition $\lambda(i_\xi\omega) = i_\xi\omega$. It then follows

Proposition 7.3.3. *We have*

$$\lambda(\zeta) = \zeta^\dagger, \quad \lambda(\zeta_0) = \zeta_0, \quad \lambda(\zeta_1) = \zeta_1. \tag{92}$$

Moreover

$$\rho(\zeta_0) = -\zeta_0. \tag{93}$$

Proof. The first equality in (92) comes from the fact that σ preserves $\mathcal{G}_Z$ and $\mathcal{G}_{Z^\dagger}$ respectively (last statement of Proposition 2.5.1) and ρ exchanges them. The second and third follows from the fact that π_0 and π_1 commutes with λ.

For the equality (93), remark that ρ is an involution that globally preserves $\mathcal{T}$, hence $\mathcal{H}_0$, as well as

$$\mathcal{H}_\lambda := \{u \in \mathcal{H}_0 \mid \lambda(u) = u\}.$$

Any fixed vector by ρ in $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$, belongs to $\mathcal{T}$ hence is null. It follows that ρ acts as -1 on $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$. □

7.3.3. *The root space decomposition.* We also write the following decomposition of ξ as

$$i_\xi\omega = \zeta_0 + \sum_{\alpha\in\Delta} \zeta_\alpha, \quad \text{where} \quad \zeta_\alpha \in \mathcal{G}_\alpha.$$

7.3.4. *Proof of the transversality of the Hitchin map.* In this paragraph, we prove Theorem 7.0.2, assuming Proposition 7.3.2. The proof is standard. As a standard notation if $(x_t)_{t\in]-1,1[}$ is a C^1-curve in a manifold M, we write

$$\dot{x}_0 := \left.\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\right|_{t=0} x_t \in \mathsf{T}_{x_0}M. \tag{94}$$

Let $(J_t, \mathrm{q}_t)_{t\in]-1,1[}$ be a family of elements of $\mathcal{E}_{m_\ell+1}$. By Theorem 6.2.1, we associate to (J_t, q_t) a homomorphism δ_t of $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ in G_0 and a δ_t-equivariant cyclic map f_t from Σ from X. Then by definition $\Psi(J_t, \mathrm{q}_t) = [\delta_t]$ is the equivalence class (by conjugation) of δ_t.

Observe first that $\xi(s) := \dot{f}_0(s)$ is an infinitesimal deformation of cyclic surfaces in X.

We want to prove the local injectivity of Ψ. Let us thus assume that

$$\dot{[\delta_0]} = 0.$$

Since the smooth manifold $\mathcal{H}(\Sigma, \mathsf{G}_0)$ only consists of irreducible representations,

$$\mathsf{T}_{\delta_0}\mathcal{H}(\Sigma, \mathsf{G}_0) = H^1_{\delta_0}(\Sigma, \mathfrak{g}).$$

Thus after possibly conjugating the family (δ_t) by a family (g_t) of elements of G_0 and replacing (f_t) by $(g_t \cdot f_t)$ we obtain that

$$\forall s \in \tilde{\sigma},\ \forall \gamma \in \pi_1(\Sigma),\quad \overset{\bullet}{f}_0(\gamma(s)) = \delta_0(\gamma)\,\overset{\bullet}{f}_0(s). \tag{95}$$

In particular, $\xi(s) := \overset{\bullet}{f}_0(s)$ is an infinitesimal deformation of closed cyclic surfaces in $\delta_0(\pi_1(\Sigma))\backslash\mathsf{X}$.

Let us fix a simple root α. Recall that by definition of cyclic surfaces, $f_0^*\omega_\alpha$ is a bijection from $\mathsf{T}\Sigma$ to $f_0^*(\mathcal{G}_\alpha)$. Thus, let ν be the vector field along Σ so that $\zeta_\alpha = f_0^*\omega_\alpha(\nu)$. Since every vector field tangent to the surface is an infinitesimal deformation of cyclic surfaces, $\mathsf{T}f_0(\nu)$ is an infinitesimal deformation of cyclic surfaces.

Let $\widehat{\xi} := \xi - \mathsf{T}f_0(\nu)$, by construction $\widehat{\xi}$ is an infinitesimal deformation of cyclic surfaces whose component along $\mathcal{G}_\alpha$ is zero. Applying Proposition 7.3.2, we obtain that $\widehat{\xi} = 0$. It remains to prove that $\overset{\bullet}{J}_0 = 0$ and $\overset{\bullet}{\mathrm{q}}_0 = 0$: that will conclude the proof of the injectivity of $\mathsf{T}\Psi$. Choosing locally a Chevalley basis x_α of $\mathcal{G}_\alpha$, we may write $\omega_\alpha = \Omega_\alpha \cdot \mathrm{x}_\alpha$ where $\Omega_\alpha \in \Omega^1(\Sigma, \mathbb{C})$. Since $\widehat{\xi} = 0$, it follows that for all roots α, $\overset{\bullet}{\Omega}_\alpha = 0$. Now for a simple root α, Ω_α is non zero and the complex structure on Σ is characterised by the fact that Ω_α is of type $(1,0)$. Thus $\overset{\bullet}{J}_0 = 0$. Similarly q is obtained by a formula involving the Ω_α, thus $\overset{\bullet}{\mathrm{q}}_0 = 0$.

7.4. **Computations of first derivatives.** From now on, we assume that ξ is an infinitesimal deformation of cyclic surfaces. We will first obtain expressions for the derivatives of ζ_0 and ζ_1 exploiting the fact that ω_0 and ω_1 vanish on cyclic surfaces. We will denote in the sequel

$$\partial = \left(\mathrm{d}^\nabla\right)^{(1,0)},\quad \overline{\partial} = \left(\mathrm{d}^\nabla\right)^{(0,1)}.$$

7.4.1. *Vanishing of ω_0 and the derivatives of ζ_0.* Here, we exploit the fact that $\omega_0|_\Sigma = 0$.

Proposition 7.4.1. *We have the following equalities in $\Omega^*(\Sigma, \mathcal{G})$*

$$\partial\zeta_0 = 2\,\check{\pi}_0(\zeta^\dagger \wedge \phi) = 2\,\check{\pi}_0(\rho(\zeta) \wedge \phi), \tag{96}$$

$$\overline{\partial}\zeta_0 = 2\,\check{\pi}_0(\zeta \wedge \phi^\dagger) = 2\,\check{\pi}_0(\rho(\zeta^\dagger) \wedge \phi^\dagger). \tag{97}$$

Proof. We have $\zeta_0 = i_\xi\omega_0$. By the definition of infinitesimal variation, and using the fact that $\check{\pi}_0$ is parrallel, we have the following equalities in $\Omega^*(\Sigma, \mathcal{G})$

$$\nabla\zeta_0 = \mathrm{d}^\nabla i_\xi\omega_0 = -i_\xi\mathrm{d}^\nabla\omega_0 = -i_\xi\mathrm{d}^\nabla\check{\pi}_0(\omega) = -i_\xi\check{\pi}_0(\mathrm{d}^\nabla\omega).$$

Thus, the curvature equation (42) yields

$$\nabla\zeta_0 = i_\xi\check{\pi}_0\left(R^\nabla + \omega \wedge \omega\right).$$

Then by Proposition 4.2.3, we have that $\check{\pi}_0(R^\nabla) = 0$. Thus we get

$$\nabla\zeta_0 = i_\xi\check{\pi}_0(\omega \wedge \omega). \tag{98}$$

Finally, since $\omega_1|_\Sigma = 0$, it follows that $(i_\xi(\omega_1 \wedge \omega_1))|_\Sigma = 0$. Thus, combining Equations (49) and (98), we get the following equalities in $\Omega^*(\Sigma, \mathcal{G})$

$$\nabla\zeta_0 = 2\, i_\xi \check{\pi}_0(\phi \wedge \phi^\dagger) = 2\, \check{\pi}_0(\zeta \wedge \phi^\dagger + \zeta^\dagger \wedge \phi).$$

Using the fact that ϕ and $\phi^\dagger$ are respectively of type $(1,0)$ and $(0,1)$, we get the first part of both equations in the proposition. To get the second part, we use that $\zeta_0 = -\rho(\zeta_0)$ and $\phi = -\rho(\phi^\dagger)$. □

7.4.2. *Vanishing of ω_1 and the derivatives of ζ_1.* We exploit the fact that $\omega_1|_\Sigma = 0$.

Proposition 7.4.2. *We have the following equalities in* $\Omega^*(\Sigma, \mathcal{G})$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\zeta_1 &= 2\,\pi_1((\zeta_1 + \zeta) \wedge \phi), \\ \overline{\partial}\zeta_1 &= 2\,\pi_1((\zeta_1 + \zeta^\dagger) \wedge \phi^\dagger). \end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

Proof. By the definition of infinitesimal variation and using that π_1 is parallel, we have

$$\nabla\zeta_1 = \mathrm{d}^\nabla i_\xi \omega_1 = -i_\xi \mathrm{d}^\nabla \pi_1(\omega) = -i_\xi \pi_1(\mathrm{d}^\nabla \omega).$$

Thus, since $\pi_1(R^\nabla) = 0$ the curvature equation (42) yields

$$\nabla\zeta_1 = i_\xi \pi_1(\omega \wedge \omega). \tag{100}$$

Observe also that we have the following equalities in $\Omega^*(\Sigma, \mathcal{G})$

$$i_\xi(\omega_1 \wedge \omega_0) = 0, \quad i_\xi(\omega_1 \wedge \omega_1) = 0. \tag{101}$$

Combining equations (50), (100), and (101) we get the following equalities in $\Omega^*(\Sigma, \mathcal{G})$

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla\zeta_1 &= i_\xi \pi_1 \left(2.\omega_1 \wedge \phi + 2.\omega_1 \wedge \phi^\dagger + \phi \wedge \phi + \phi^\dagger \wedge \phi^\dagger\right) \\ &= 2\,\pi_1 \left(\zeta_1 \wedge \phi + \zeta_1 \wedge \phi^\dagger + \zeta \wedge \phi + \zeta^\dagger \wedge \phi^\dagger)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now we can decompose the last equation into types, using the fact that $\phi|_\Sigma$ is of type $(1,0)$ and $\phi^\dagger|_\Sigma$ is of type $(0,1)$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\zeta_1 &= 2\,\pi_1(\zeta_1 \wedge \phi + \zeta \wedge \phi), \\ \overline{\partial}\zeta_1 &= 2\,\pi_1(\zeta_1 \wedge \phi^\dagger + \zeta^\dagger \wedge \phi^\dagger). \end{aligned}$$

The proposition now follows. □

7.5. **Again, computation of first derivatives.** So far we have obtained direct information about the first derivatives of ζ_0 and ζ_1 using vanishing of the 1-forms ω_0 and ω_1. In this section, we obtain constraints on the derivatives of ζ and $\zeta^\dagger$ using the vanishing of 2-forms.

7.5.1. *A preliminary computation.* The next proposition does not use the fact that ξ is an infinitesimal deformation of cyclic surfaces.

Proposition 7.5.1. *We have the following equality in* $\Omega^*(\Sigma, \mathcal{G})$

$$(i_\xi \mathrm{d}^\nabla \phi)^{(0,1)} = -2\,\pi((\zeta_1 + \zeta^\dagger) \wedge \phi^\dagger), \tag{102}$$

$$(i_\xi \mathrm{d}^\nabla \phi)^{(1,0)} = -2\,\zeta_0 \wedge \phi. \tag{103}$$

Symmetrically

$$(i_\xi \mathrm{d}^\nabla \phi^\dagger)^{(0,1)} = -2\,\zeta_0 \wedge \phi^\dagger, \tag{104}$$

$$(i_\xi \mathrm{d}^\nabla \phi^\dagger)^{(1,0)} = -2\,\pi^\dagger((\zeta_1 + \zeta) \wedge \phi). \tag{105}$$

Proof. First observe that using Assertion (51) of Proposition 4.3.2

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d}^\nabla \phi = \mathrm{d}^\nabla \pi(\omega) &= \pi(\mathrm{d}^\nabla \omega)\\ &= -\pi(\omega \wedge \omega + R^\nabla)\\ &= -\pi(\omega \wedge \omega)\\ &= -2\,\omega_0 \wedge \phi - 2\,\pi(\omega_1 \wedge \phi^\dagger)\\ &\quad - \pi(\phi^\dagger \wedge \phi^\dagger) - \pi(\omega_1 \wedge \omega_1).\end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

For a cyclic surface $\omega_i|_\Sigma = 0$ for $i = 0, 1$, and thus for $i, j = 0, 1$

$$i_\xi(\omega_i \wedge \omega_j)|_\Sigma = 0.$$

Thus Equation (106) yields the following equality in $\Omega^*(\Sigma, \mathcal{G})$

$$\begin{aligned}i_\xi \mathrm{d}^\nabla \phi &= -i_\xi \left(2\,\omega_0 \wedge \phi + \pi\left(2\,\omega_1 \wedge \phi^\dagger + \phi^\dagger \wedge \phi^\dagger\right)\right)\\ &= -2\,\zeta_0 \wedge \phi - 2\,\pi(\zeta_1 \wedge \phi^\dagger + \zeta^\dagger \wedge \phi^\dagger).\end{aligned}$$

Since ϕ is of type $(1,0)$ and $\phi^\dagger$ is of type $(0,1)$ the previous equation yields the first part of the proposition, where in the second equality, we use that $\pi(\zeta_0 \wedge \phi) = \zeta_0 \wedge \phi$. The second part follows by symmetry. □

7.5.2. *Vanishing of $\phi + \rho(\phi^\dagger)$ and the derivatives of $\zeta + \rho(\eta^\dagger)$.* Let $\mu = \zeta + \rho(\zeta^\dagger)$, then

Proposition 7.5.2. *We have the following equality in $\Omega^*(\Sigma, \mathcal{G})$.*

$$\partial\mu = 4\,\zeta_0 \wedge \phi. \tag{107}$$

Proof. Let $\beta = \phi + \rho(\phi^\dagger)$. Using Proposition 7.5.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned}(i_\xi \mathrm{d}^\nabla \beta)^{(1,0)} &= -2\,\zeta_0 \wedge \phi - 2\,\rho(\zeta_0 \wedge \phi^\dagger)\\ &= -2\,\zeta_0 \wedge \phi + 2\,\rho(\zeta_0) \wedge \phi\\ &= -4\,\zeta_0 \wedge \phi,\end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

where we used Equation (93) in the last equality. Then, by the vanishing of β along cyclic surfaces, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(i_\xi \mathrm{d}^\nabla \beta)^{(1,0)} &= -(\mathrm{d}^\nabla i_\xi \beta)^{(1,0)}\\ &= -\partial\mu.\end{aligned} \tag{109}$$

This proves the result. □

7.5.3. *Vanishing of $\phi \wedge \phi$ and the derivatives of ζ.*

Proposition 7.5.3. *We have the following equalities in $\Omega^*(\Sigma, \mathcal{G})$*

$$(\nabla\zeta) \wedge \phi = 2\,\phi \wedge \pi((\zeta_1 + \zeta^\dagger) \wedge \phi^\dagger), \tag{110}$$

$$(\nabla\zeta^\dagger) \wedge \phi^\dagger = 2\,\phi^\dagger \wedge \pi^\dagger((\zeta_1 + \zeta) \wedge \phi). \tag{111}$$

Proof. Let $\Psi = \phi \wedge \phi$. By the definition of infinitesimal variation, the following equalities in $\Omega^*(\Sigma, \mathcal{G})$ holds

$$\mathrm{d}^\nabla i_\xi \Psi = -i_\xi \mathrm{d}^\nabla \Psi = -2\, i_\xi(\mathrm{d}^\nabla \phi \wedge \phi). \tag{112}$$

Recall that by Equation (68) for a cyclic surface $\mathrm{d}^\nabla \phi|_\Sigma = 0$. Thus the last equation yields (after a type decomposition)

$$\mathrm{d}^\nabla i_\xi \Psi = -2\, \phi \wedge (i_\xi \mathrm{d}^\nabla \phi)^{(0,1)}. \tag{113}$$

Then Equation (102) from Proposition 7.5.1 yields

$$\mathrm{d}^\nabla i_\xi \Psi = 4\, \phi \wedge \pi((\zeta_1 + \zeta^\dagger) \wedge \phi^\dagger).$$

Now, $i_\xi \Psi = 2\, \zeta \wedge \phi$. Thus the previous equation combined with the fact that $\mathrm{d}^\nabla \phi|_\Sigma = 0$ yields

$$\nabla \zeta \wedge \phi = 2\, \pi((\zeta_1 + \zeta^\dagger) \wedge \phi^\dagger) \wedge \phi.$$

A symmetric argument (using $\phi^\dagger \wedge \phi^\dagger = 0$ along Σ) yields the last statement. □

7.6. **Computation of second order derivatives.** We now combine the two previous sections to obtain formulas for the second derivatives of ζ_1 and ζ_0.

Proposition 7.6.1. *We have*

$$\mathrm{d}^\nabla \partial \zeta_1 = 4\, \pi_1 \left((\zeta_1 \wedge \phi^\dagger) \wedge \phi \right), \tag{114}$$

$$\mathrm{d}^\nabla \overline{\partial} \zeta_1 = 4\, \pi_1 \left((\zeta_1 \wedge \phi) \wedge \phi^\dagger \right). \tag{115}$$

Proof. By Proposition 7.4.2

$$\partial \zeta_1 = 2\, \pi_1((\zeta_1 + \zeta) \wedge \phi).$$

Thus,

$$\mathrm{d}^\nabla \partial \zeta_1 = 2\, \mathrm{d}^\nabla \pi_1(\zeta_1 \wedge \phi) + 2\, \mathrm{d}^\nabla \pi_1(\zeta \wedge \phi). \tag{116}$$

Let us first consider the derivatives of $\pi_1(\zeta_1 \wedge \phi)$. Since $\mathrm{d}^\nabla \phi = 0$ by Equation (68), we have, using Proposition 7.4.2 for the third equality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}^\nabla(\pi_1(\zeta_1 \wedge \phi)) &= \pi_1(\nabla \zeta_1 \wedge \phi) \\ &= \pi_1(\overline{\partial} \zeta_1 \wedge \phi) \\ &= 2\, \pi_1 \left(\phi \wedge \pi_1 \left((\zeta_1 + \zeta^\dagger) \wedge \phi^\dagger \right) \right). \end{aligned} \tag{117}$$

Similarly, now using Proposition 7.5.3

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}^\nabla(\pi_1(\zeta \wedge \phi)) &= \pi_1(\nabla \zeta \wedge \phi) \\ &= 2\, \pi_1 \left(\phi \wedge \pi \left((\zeta_1 + \zeta^\dagger) \wedge \phi^\dagger \right) \right). \end{aligned} \tag{118}$$

Combining Equations (117) and (118), we get

$$\mathrm{d}^\nabla \partial \zeta_1 = 4.\pi_1 \left(\phi \wedge (\pi_1 + \pi) \left((\zeta_1 + \zeta^\dagger) \wedge \phi^\dagger \right) \right). \tag{119}$$

Since by Proposition 2.2.2,

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_{Z^\dagger}] &\subset \mathcal{G}_1 + \mathcal{G}_Z, \\ [\mathcal{G}_{Z^\dagger}, \mathcal{G}_{Z^\dagger}] &\subset \mathcal{G}_1 + \mathcal{G}_Z, \end{aligned} \tag{120}$$

we get

$$\mathrm{d}^\nabla \partial \zeta_1 = 4.\pi_1 \left(\phi \wedge \left((\zeta_1 + \zeta^\dagger) \wedge \phi^\dagger \right) \right). \tag{121}$$

The Jacobi identity yields

$$(\zeta^\dagger \wedge \phi^\dagger) \wedge \phi = \zeta^\dagger \wedge (\phi^\dagger \wedge \phi) + \phi^\dagger \wedge (\zeta^\dagger \wedge \phi) \in \Omega^2(\Sigma, \mathcal{G}_{Z^\dagger}).$$

Thus

$$\pi_1\left((\zeta^\dagger \wedge \phi^\dagger) \wedge \phi\right) = 0.$$

Thus in the end, Equation (121) yields

$$\mathrm{d}^\nabla \partial \zeta_1 = 4.\pi_1\left(\phi \wedge (\zeta_1 \wedge \phi^\dagger)\right). \tag{122}$$

The proof of the second equation of the proposition follows by inverting the role of ϕ and $\phi^\dagger$. □

Proposition 7.6.2. *We have*

$$\mathrm{d}^\nabla \overline{\partial} \zeta_0 = 4\,\check{\pi}_0((\zeta_0 \wedge \phi) \wedge \phi^\dagger). \tag{123}$$

Proof. By Proposition 7.4.1, we have

$$\overline{\partial} \zeta_0 = \check{\pi}_0(\mu \wedge \phi^\dagger). \tag{124}$$

By Proposition 7.5.2, and using the fact that $\mathrm{d}^\nabla \phi^\dagger = 0$, it follows that

$$\mathrm{d}^\nabla(\overline{\partial}\zeta_0) = \check{\pi}_0(\partial\mu \wedge \phi^\dagger) \tag{125}$$

$$= 4\,\check{\pi}_0((\zeta_0 \wedge \phi) \wedge \phi^\dagger). \tag{126}$$

□

7.7. **Proof of the infinitesimal rigidity.** Our goal is now to prove Proposition 7.3.2. We will use freely in the sequel the fact that for $A = \check{\pi}_0, \pi_1$ or π_0 $\int_\Sigma \langle u | A(v)\rangle = \int_\Sigma \langle A(u)|v\rangle$.

7.7.1. *First step.*

Proposition 7.7.1. *Let ξ be an infinitesimal deformation of a closed cyclic surface. Then*

$$\zeta_1 \wedge \phi = \zeta_1 \wedge \phi^\dagger = 0, \tag{127}$$

$$\nabla \zeta_1 = 0, \tag{128}$$

$$\pi_1(\zeta \wedge \phi) = 0. \tag{129}$$

Proof. Let Σ be a closed surface. By Proposition 7.6.1,

$$\mathrm{d}^\nabla \partial \zeta_1 = 4\,\pi_1\left((\zeta_1 \wedge \phi^\dagger) \wedge \phi\right).$$

Denoting by $\langle\,|\,\rangle$ the Killing form, an integration yields

$$\int_\Sigma \langle \rho(\zeta_1) | \mathrm{d}^\nabla \partial \zeta_1\rangle = 4 \int_\Sigma \langle \rho(\zeta_1) | \pi_1\left((\zeta_1 \wedge \phi^\dagger) \wedge \phi\right)\rangle.$$

Observe now that since ρ preserves $\mathfrak{g}_1$, $\pi_1(\rho(\zeta_1)) = \rho(\zeta_1)$. Thus for all κ,

$$\int_\Sigma \langle \rho(\zeta_1) | \pi_1(\kappa)\rangle = \int_\Sigma \langle \rho(\zeta_1) | \kappa\rangle.$$

Thus

$$\int_\Sigma \langle \rho(\zeta_1) | \mathrm{d}^\nabla \partial \zeta_1\rangle = 4 \int_\Sigma \langle \rho(\zeta_1) | (\zeta_1 \wedge \phi^\dagger) \wedge \phi\rangle.$$

Using Equation (31) and the fact that $\phi^\dagger = -\rho(\phi)$, we get

$$\int_\Sigma \langle \rho(\zeta_1) | \mathrm{d}^\nabla \partial \zeta_1 \rangle = -4 \int_\Sigma \langle \rho(\zeta_1) \wedge \phi | \zeta_1 \wedge \rho(\phi) \rangle.$$

An integration by part and Proposition 4.1.1 finally yields

$$0 \leqslant i \int_\Sigma \langle \rho(\partial\zeta_1) | \partial\zeta_1 \rangle = 4i \int_\Sigma \langle \rho(\zeta_1) \wedge \phi | \zeta_1 \wedge \rho(\phi) \rangle \leqslant 0.$$

It then follows that

$$\partial \zeta_1 = 0 \tag{130}$$

$$\zeta_1 \wedge \phi^\dagger = 0 \tag{131}$$

Symmetrically

$$\overline{\partial} \zeta_1 = 0 \tag{132}$$

$$\zeta_1 \wedge \phi = 0. \tag{133}$$

Assertion (127) is just Equations (133) and (131).
Assertion (128) now follows from Equations (132) and (130).
Assertion (129) then follows from Proposition 7.4.2 and Equation (133). □

7.7.2. *Second step.*

Proposition 7.7.2. *Let Σ be a closed surface. Let ξ be an infinitesimal variation. Then*

$$\nabla \zeta_0 = 0 \tag{134}$$

$$\zeta_0 \wedge \phi = 0 \tag{135}$$

$$\check{\pi}_0(\zeta \wedge \phi^\dagger) = 0. \tag{136}$$

Proof. Using Proposition 7.6.2

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_S \langle \mathrm{d}^\nabla \overline{\partial} \zeta_0 | \rho(\zeta_0) \rangle &= 4 \int_S \langle \check{\pi}_0(\zeta_0 \wedge \phi) \wedge \phi^\dagger) | \rho(\zeta_0) \rangle \\
&= 4 \int_S \langle (\zeta_0 \wedge \phi) \wedge \phi^\dagger | \rho(\zeta_0) \rangle \\
&= 4 \int_S \langle \zeta_0 \wedge \phi | \rho(\zeta_0) \wedge \phi^\dagger \rangle \\
&= -4 \int_S \langle \zeta_0 \wedge \phi | \rho(\zeta_0 \wedge \phi) \rangle,
\end{aligned} \tag{137}$$

where we used that $\rho(\phi) = -\phi^\dagger$ in the last equality and Equation (31) just before. Thus after an integration by part we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{4} \int_S \langle \overline{\partial} \zeta_0 | \rho(\overline{\partial} \zeta_0) \rangle &= \frac{1}{4} \int_S \langle \overline{\partial} \zeta_0 | \partial \rho(\zeta_0) \rangle \\
&= -\frac{1}{4} \int_S \langle \mathrm{d}^\nabla \overline{\partial} \zeta_0 | \rho(\zeta_0) \rangle \\
&= \int_S \langle \zeta_0 \wedge \phi | \rho(\zeta_0 \wedge \phi) \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{138}$$

But, by Proposition 4.1.1,

$$0 \leqslant \frac{i}{4}\int_S \langle \overline{\partial}\zeta_0 | \rho\left(\overline{\partial}\zeta_0\right)\rangle = i\int_S \langle \zeta_0 \wedge \phi | \rho\left(\zeta_0 \wedge \phi\right)\rangle \leqslant 0. \tag{139}$$

Thus, $\zeta_0 \wedge \phi = 0$ and $\overline{\partial}\zeta_0 = 0$. Since $\rho\left(\zeta_0\right) = -\zeta_0$. It follows that

$$0 = \rho\left(\overline{\partial}\zeta_0\right) = \partial\rho\left(\zeta_0\right) = -\partial\zeta_0.$$

Thus $\partial\zeta_0 = 0$. It follows that $\mathrm{d}^\nabla\zeta_0 = 0$.

□

7.7.3. *Proof of Proposition 7.3.2.* Recall that we have the decomposition

$$\omega(\xi) = \zeta_0 + \zeta_1 + \zeta + \zeta^\dagger.$$

We assume in this section that there exists a simple root α, so that the component $\zeta_\alpha = \omega_\alpha(\xi)$ of ξ along $\mathcal{G}_\alpha$ vanishes (although the first proposition does not uses this hypothesis).

Proposition 7.7.3. *We have $\zeta_0 = 0$ and $\zeta_1 = 0$.*

Proof. From Equation (128) of Proposition 7.7.1, we have that $\nabla\zeta_1 = 0$. Observe that

$$\zeta_1 = \sum_{\gamma\in\Delta\setminus Z\cup Z^\dagger} \zeta_\gamma, \text{ where } \zeta_\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_\gamma.$$

Since the line bundles $\mathcal{G}_\gamma$ are parallel, it follows that $\nabla\zeta_\gamma = 0$ for all γ not in Z nor in $Z^\dagger$. Recall that $\mathcal{G}_\alpha$ is identified for all simple roots as $\mathcal{K}^{-1}$ over Σ a complex line thanks to ϕ_α. It then follows that $\mathcal{G}_\beta$ is identified with $\mathcal{K}^{-\deg(\beta)}$ for any root β. Then since Σ is not a torus, $\mathcal{K}^{-\deg(\gamma)}$ is non trivial and ζ_γ vanishes at some point, hence everywhere since it is parallel.

By Proposition 7.7.2, $\zeta_0 \wedge \phi = 0$, thus we get that for all simple root α, $\zeta_0 \wedge \omega_\alpha = 0$. By Definition 6.0.3 Property (5), ω_α never vanishes. Thus $\alpha(\zeta_0) = 0$. Since the simple roots form a basis of $\mathfrak{h}^*$, $\zeta_0 = 0$. □

It follows from the previous proposition that

$$\xi = \zeta + \zeta^\dagger. \tag{140}$$

It remains to prove that $\zeta = 0$ as well as $\zeta^\dagger = 0$. We now split the proof in two cases.

7.7.4. *First case:* $\mathsf{G} = \mathsf{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$. Remark that in this case we have three positive roots, two simple that we name α, β and one long $\eta = \alpha + \beta$. Also, $\check{\pi}_0 \neq 0$ and $\pi_1 = 0$.

Proposition 7.7.4. *Assume that $\mathsf{G} = \mathsf{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$, then $\zeta = 0$ and $\zeta^\dagger = 0$.*

Proof. Let α and β be the two simple roots and $\eta = \alpha + \beta$ be the longest root. Let us choose locally on Σ a Chevalley frame $\{\mathrm{x}_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Delta}$ such that $\rho(\mathrm{x}_\alpha) = \mathrm{x}_{-\alpha}$, then we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi^\dagger &= \psi_\eta\,\mathrm{x}_{-\eta} + \psi_\alpha\,\mathrm{x}_\alpha + \psi_\beta\,\mathrm{x}_\beta,\\
\phi &= \overline{\psi_\eta}\,\mathrm{x}_\eta + \overline{\psi_\alpha}\,\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha} + \overline{\psi_\beta}\,\mathrm{x}_{-\beta},\\
\zeta &= \mu_\eta\,\mathrm{x}_\eta + \mu_\alpha\,\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha} + \mu_\beta\,\mathrm{x}_{-\beta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{141}$$

Our hypothesis in that Section is that $\mu_\alpha = 0$. Observe now that

$$\zeta \wedge \phi^\dagger = -\mu_\eta.\psi_\eta \mathrm{h}_\eta + \mu_\beta.\psi_\beta \mathrm{h}_\beta + \mu_\alpha.\psi_\alpha \mathrm{h}_\alpha. \tag{142}$$

By Proposition 3.2.3 Property (1), $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is generated by h_η. Let us write

$$h_\beta = u + \lambda\, h_\eta,$$

with $\langle u|h_\eta\rangle = 0$, so that $\widehat{\pi}_0(u) = u$. Observe also that $\langle h_\beta|u\rangle = \langle u|u\rangle \neq 0$, since h_β is not proportional to h_η. Thus the equalities $\check{\pi}_0(\zeta \wedge \phi^\dagger) = 0$ and $\mu_\alpha = 0$ imply that

$$0 = \langle \zeta \wedge \phi^\dagger | u\rangle = \mu_\beta \psi_\beta \ \langle \mathrm{h}_\beta | u\rangle\,.$$

Since ψ_β never vanishes, it follows that $\mu_\beta = 0$. Thus $\zeta \in \mathcal{G}_\eta$.

Since by the reality condition (92), $\zeta^\dagger = \lambda(\zeta)$, it follows that $\zeta^\dagger = \mu_\eta\, \mathrm{x}_{-\eta} \in \mathcal{G}_{-\eta}$ and

$$\zeta^\dagger \wedge \phi^\dagger = \mu_\eta \psi_\alpha [\mathrm{x}_{-\eta}, \mathrm{x}_\alpha] + \mu_\eta \psi_\beta [\mathrm{x}_{-\eta}, \mathrm{x}_\beta] = \pi(\zeta^\dagger \wedge \phi^\dagger). \tag{143}$$

Then the component of $\phi \wedge \pi(\zeta^\dagger \wedge \phi^\dagger)$ along $\mathcal{G}_{-\eta}$ is

$$\mu_\eta \left(\overline{\psi_\alpha} \wedge \psi_\alpha\, [\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha}, [\mathrm{x}_{-\eta}, \mathrm{x}_\alpha]] + \overline{\psi_\beta} \wedge \psi_\beta\, [\mathrm{x}_{-\beta}, [\mathrm{x}_{-\eta}, \mathrm{x}_\beta]]\right). \tag{144}$$

By Proposition 7.5.3, we have

$$\nabla\zeta \wedge \phi = 2\, \phi \wedge \pi(\zeta^\dagger \wedge \phi^\dagger) \tag{145}$$

Since $\zeta \in \mathcal{G}_\eta$, the component on $\mathcal{G}_{-\eta}$ of $\nabla\zeta \wedge \phi$ is zero. Thus we obtain

$$0 = \mu_\eta \left(\overline{\psi_\alpha} \wedge \psi_\alpha\, [\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha}, [\mathrm{x}_{-\eta}, \mathrm{x}_\alpha]] + \overline{\psi_\beta} \wedge \psi_\beta\, [\mathrm{x}_{-\beta}, [\mathrm{x}_{-\eta}, \mathrm{x}_\beta]]\right).$$

We can use an element $\mathfrak{w}$ of the Weyl group that fixes η and exchanges α and β, we then get that

$$\mathfrak{w}([\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha}, [\mathrm{x}_{-\eta}, \mathrm{x}_\alpha]]) = [\mathrm{x}_{-\beta}, [\mathrm{x}_{-\eta}, \mathrm{x}_\beta]]$$

On the other hand, $[\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha}, [\mathrm{x}_{-\eta}, \mathrm{x}_\alpha]]$ is along $\mathrm{x}_{-\eta}$ and thus fixed by $\mathfrak{w}$. It follows that

$$[\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha}, [\mathrm{x}_{-\eta}, \mathrm{x}_\alpha]] = [\mathrm{x}_{-\beta}, [\mathrm{x}_{-\eta}, \mathrm{x}_\beta]] \neq 0.$$

Thus Equation (144) yields

$$0 = \mu_\eta \left(\overline{\psi_\alpha} \wedge \psi_\alpha + \overline{\psi_\beta} \wedge \psi_\beta\right).$$

Since $\overline{\psi_\alpha} \wedge \psi_\alpha$ and $\overline{\psi_\beta} \wedge \psi_\beta$ are both of type $(1,1)$ and positive, we get that $\mu_\eta = 0$. We have finished proving that $\zeta^\dagger = \zeta = 0$. □

7.7.5. *The general case.* Now we assume that $\mathsf{G} \neq \mathsf{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$. Then we prove

Proposition 7.7.5. *Assume that* $\mathsf{G} \neq \mathsf{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$, *then* $\zeta = 0$ *and* $\zeta^\dagger = 0$.

Proof. From Equation (129)

$$\pi_1(\zeta \wedge \phi) = 0. \tag{146}$$

Let α_0 and β_0 be a pair of simple roots such that $\gamma = \alpha_0 + \beta_0$ is a (positive) root. Recall that $\mathsf{G} \neq \mathsf{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$ and thus $\gamma \neq \eta$. Then by the previous equation, the component of v of $\zeta \wedge \phi$ along $\mathcal{G}_\gamma$ is zero. But

$$v = \sum_{\alpha,\beta \in Z | \alpha+\beta=\gamma} (\zeta_\alpha \wedge \phi_\beta + \zeta_\beta \wedge \phi_\alpha).$$

However $\alpha-\eta$ is not a positive root when α is a simple root and since every positive root can be written uniquely as a sum of simple roots, it follows that

$$0 = v = \zeta_{\alpha_0} \wedge \phi_{\beta_0} + \zeta_{\beta_0} \wedge \phi_{\alpha_0}.$$

Thus for every pair of simple roots α and β so $\alpha+\beta$ is a root,

$$\zeta_\alpha \wedge \phi_\beta = -\zeta_\beta \wedge \phi_\alpha.$$

Since the Dynkin diagram is connected and the ϕ_α are not vanishing, since $\zeta_\alpha = 0$ for some simple root, then $\zeta_\beta = 0$ for all simple roots β.

Finally, we have obtained that $\zeta = \zeta_\eta \in \mathcal{G}_\eta$. Using Equation (129) again, we obtain that $\pi_1(\zeta_\eta \wedge \sum_{\alpha\in\Pi} \phi_{-\alpha}) = 0$. Since $\mathsf{G} \neq \mathsf{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$, there exist a simple root α so that $\gamma := \eta - \alpha$ is a positive root not in $Z \cup Z^\dagger$. Thus taking the component along $\mathcal{G}_\gamma$ one gets that $\zeta \wedge \phi_{-\alpha} = 0$. By the injectivity of ϕ_α, $\zeta = 0$. A symmetric argument yields $\zeta^\dagger = 0$. □

8. Properness and the final argument

Let G_0 be a split real simple group of rank 2 and m_2 the degree of its longest root. Let $\mathcal{E}_{m_2}$ be total space of the vector bundle over Teichmüller space whose fibre at a complex structure J is $H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{K}^{m_2+1})$.

Let now Ψ be the map which associates to (J, q) in $\mathcal{E}_{m_2}$, the representation associated to the Higgs bundle $(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}, \Phi_q)$ as in Paragraph 5.2 and Section 7. Our main result is now

Theorem 8.0.6. *The map Ψ is diffeomorphism.*

This result has Theorem 1.1.1 and Theorem 1.2.1 as immediate consequences.

8.1. **A theorem in differential calculus.** Let $\pi : P \to M$ be a smooth fibre bundle. Assume that the fibre $P_m := \pi^{-1}(m)$ at any point m of M is connected. Let F be a smooth positive function from P to $\mathbb{R}$ and let $F_m = F|\, P_m$. Let finally $N \subset P$ be the set of critical points of F_m for all m:

$$N = \{x \in P \mid \mathrm{d}_x F_{\pi(x)} = 0\}.$$

Assume that

(1) For all m, F_m is proper,
(2) N is a connected submanifold of P everywhere transverse to the fibres of π.

Then we have

Theorem 8.1.1. *Assume the above hypothesis, then*

- *π is a diffeomorphism of N into M,*
- *F_m has a unique critical point which is an absolute minimum.*

8.1.1. *Some preliminary lemmas.* Let f be a smooth function defined on a manifold Q diffeomorphic to a closed ball. Let m be a critical point of f on Q. Assume that f has no critical point in $Q \setminus \{m\}$.

The first Lemma is obvious,

Lemma 8.1.2. *Assume that m is a local minimum of f. There exists an neighborhood V of f in the C^1-topology, such that if $g \in V$, and g has a at most one critical point in Q, then this critical point is a local minimum.*

The second Lemma is the following

Lemma 8.1.3. *Let $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of functions converging to f in the C^1 topology. Assume that for every n, f_n has a unique critical point m_n in Q. Assume furthermore that m_n is a local minimum for f_n and assume that $\{m_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to m. Then m is a local minimum of f.*

Let us explain the intuition behind this lemma. For simplicity assume $f_n(m_n) = 0$. In the nice case when f_n are all constant on the boundary, then the result is obviously true: m_n are global minima and thus so is m. We want to reduce to this case by finding a small –but not too small– neighbourhood of m_n bounded by a level set. In other words, find ε_n positive so that

(1) all ε_n are uniformly bounded away from 0 by some ε_0 (produced by the first step below).
(2) A connected component of the level set $L_n = f_n^{-1}(\varepsilon_n)$ bounds an set O_n which contains m and does not touch the boundary.

Then using the initial remark and replacing Q by O_n yields the result. In order to obtain a lower bound on ε_n, we consider the maximum of those ε_n which satisfies (2). It follows that we have a gradient line γ_n of f_n joining m_n to the boundary whose value by f_n is $[0, \varepsilon_n]$. If $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ tends to zero, then by taking limits of γ_n, one obtains a subset on which f is constant and equal to zero and actually consists only in critical points. This would be the contradiction.

Let us now proceed carefully to the actual proof.

8.1.2. *Proof of Lemma 8.1.3: first steps.* For simplicity we may as well assume that for all n, $f_n(m_n) = 0$. Choose an auxiliary Riemannian metric. Let $(\phi_t^n)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be the gradient flow of f_n.

Let Z_n be the set of those points z in ∂Q such that an f_n-gradient line issued from m_n hits z (after possibly touching the boundary before). Let B_n be a small closed neighbourhood of m_n, such that the inverse gradient line of any point in B_n converges to m_n.

Proposition 8.1.4. *The set Z_n is not empty*

Proof. Let $x \neq m_n$ be a point in B_n. Let $t \to \gamma_n(t)$ be the gradient flow of x_n. After a finite time t_0, $\gamma_n(t)$ leaves B_n and never come back afterwards. Since f_n has no critical point outside B_n, the norm of $\dot{\gamma}_n(t)$ is uniformly bounded from below for $t > t_0$. Since f_n is bounded, it follows that $\gamma_n(t)$ hits the boundary after a finite time. Thus Z_n is not empty. □

Proposition 8.1.5. *The set Z_n is closed.*

Proof. Since the gradient of f_n is bounded from below on $Q \setminus B_n$ and f is bounded, there exist some positive T so that for all $z \in Z_n$, $\phi_{-T}^n(z) \in B_n$. Thus if a sequence $\{z_p\}_{p\in\mathbb{N}}$ of points of Z converges to z, it follows by continuity that $\phi_{-T}^n(z) \in B_n$. In particular $z \in Z_n$. Thus Z_n is closed. □

Proposition 8.1.6. *There exists ε_0 so that*

$$\forall n, \forall z \in Z_n,\ f_n(z) > \varepsilon_0 > 0. \tag{147}$$

Proof. Let us work by contradiction and assume that we can find a sequence $\{z_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $z_n \in Z_n$ so that $f_n(z_n) \to 0$. Let γ_n be the gradient line of f_n issuing from z_n. We choose a subsequence so that $\{z_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to a point $z \neq m$. Let γ be a Hausdorff limit of a subsequence of the sequence of closed connected sets $\{W_n := \overline{\gamma_n[-\infty, 0]}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Then the hypothesis of the paragraph implies

(1) the function f is constant and equal to zero on the connected set γ: indeed $f_n(W_n) \subset [0, f_n(z_n)]$.
(2) let ϕ_t be the gradient flow of f, then for all positive t, we also have $\phi_{-t}(\gamma) \subset \gamma$.

From both previous facts, it follows that all points in the connected set γ – and in particular $z \neq m$– are critical, which is a contradiction with our hypothesis on f. □

8.1.3. *Proof of Lemma 8.1.3: last steps.* Let γ_n be an orbit of the gradient of f_n that connects m_n to a point z_n in ∂Q. Let $0 < \alpha < \varepsilon_0$ where ε_0 is obtained from Proposition 8.1.6. Let $L^n_\alpha = f_n^{-1}(\alpha)$. Observe that since $f_n(z_n) > \alpha$, L^n_α intersects γ_n in an unique point q_n. Let S^n_α be the connected component of L^n_α containing q_n.

Proposition 8.1.7. *For all α less than ε_0, S^n_α is a closed submanifold of $Q \setminus \partial Q$ bounding an open set B^n_α containing m_n.*

Proof. Since m_n is a local minimum for f_n there exists β (depending on n) with $0 < \beta < \varepsilon_0$ such that all gradient lines passing though S^n_β ends up at m_n. Then $S^n_\beta \cap \partial Q \subset Z_n$ but since $\beta < \varepsilon_n = \inf\{f_n(z) \mid z \in Z_n\}$ it follows that $\mathrm{S}^n_\beta \cap \partial Q = \emptyset$. Thus S^n_β is a closed submanifold of $Q \setminus \partial Q$ and bounds an open set B^n_β containing m_n.

We may choose an auxiliary Riemannian metric (depending on n) so that the norm of the gradient of f_n is 1 outside B^n_β. It follows that if

$$t < \varepsilon_0 - \beta,$$

then $\phi_t(S^n_\beta)$ is closed submanifold of $Q \setminus \partial Q$, intersecting γ_n and on which f_n is equal to $t + \beta$. Thus

$$\phi_t(S^n_\beta) = S^n_{t+\beta}. \tag{148}$$

It follows that for all α less than ε_0, S^n_α bounds an open set B^n_α containing m_n. □

Proposition 8.1.8. *There exists an open set O, with $\overline{O} \subset Q \setminus \partial Q$, such that f is constant on ∂O.*

Proof. Since the gradient of f_n is uniformly bounded from above there exists some positive β such that for n large enough

$$d\left(S^n_{\varepsilon_0/2}, S^n_{\varepsilon_0/4}\right) > \beta. \tag{149}$$

In particular

$$d\left(\partial Q, S^n_{\varepsilon_0/4}\right) > \beta. \tag{150}$$

It follows that $\{S^n_{\varepsilon_0/4}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converge to a connected component $S_{\varepsilon_0/4}$ of a level set of f, which is a closed submanifold in $Q \setminus \partial Q$, which thus bounds an open set O. □

This last proposition implies Lemma 8.1.3: f has a minimum on O which has to be m since f has a unique critical point in Q. Thus m is a local minimum for f.

8.1.4. *Proof of Theorem 8.1.1.* By assumption N is a closed connected submanifold transverse to the fibres.

For any point m in N, the transversality hypothesis implies that we can find neighbourhoods U of $\pi(m)$, W of m so that we can identify W with $U \times Q$, where Q is diffeomorphic to an open ball and $\pi : U \times Q \to U$ is the projection on the first factor.

Let X be the subset of those x in N such that x is a local minimal point of $F_{\pi(x)}$. Then X is non empty since F_m is proper.

Then using the neighborhood U and $W = U \times Q$ as above, we obtain that X is open by Lemma 8.1.2 and closed by Lemma 8.1.3. By connectedness, $X = N$.

Thus every critical point of f_m is a local minimum. Since f_m is proper positive and P_m is connected, elementary Morse theory tells us that f_m has a unique critical point which is an absolute minimum. In particular, the local diffeomorphism π from N to M is injective and surjective, thus a global diffeomorphism.

8.2. **Proof of the main Theorem.** Let $P = \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{H}(\Sigma, \mathsf{G}_0)$ where $\mathcal{T}$ is Teichmüller space and $\mathcal{H}(\Sigma, \mathsf{G}_0)$ is the Hitchin component of G_0. Let π be the projection on the second factor. Let F be the function which associates to every (J, δ) in P the energy of the unique δ-equivariant harmonic map in the symmetric space $\mathsf{S}(\mathsf{G}_0)$ of G_0. By [36], F is smooth positive and F_δ is a proper map. By [41], [42] and [45], the critical points of F_δ are equivariant minimal mappings.

Finally by Hitchin fundamental result in [26], P is diffeomorphic to the bundle over $\mathcal{T}$ whose fibre at every point is $\mathcal{E}_2 \oplus \mathcal{E}_{m_2+1}$. From Theorem 7.0.2 the map $\widehat{\Psi} : (J, \mathrm{q}) \mapsto (J, \Psi(J, \mathrm{q}))$ is transverse to the fibre. Moreover Ψ is an embedding and its image N is precisely the pairs (J, δ) such that the δ-equivariant harmonic mapping f from Σ equipped with J has a vanishing Hopf differential, that is f is minimal. Thus N satisfy the conditions of the Theorem 8.1.1.

The main Theorem then follows.

9. The Kähler structures

We state a more precise result using the notation of the introduction. For any integer greater than 1, let $\mathcal{E}_n$ be the holomorphic vector bundle over Teichmüller space whose fibre at a Riemann surface Σ is

$$(\mathcal{E}_m)_\Sigma := H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{K}^m).$$

Let $\mathrm{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_\ell)$, with all $m_i > 1$. We denote by $\mathcal{E}(\mathrm{m})$ be the holomorphic vector bundle over Teichmüller space whose fibre at a Riemann surface Σ is

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathrm{m})_\Sigma := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\ell} (\mathcal{E}_{m_i})_\Sigma .$$

Proposition 9.0.1. *The complex vector bundle $\overline{\mathcal{E}(\mathrm{m})}$ carries a holomorphic structure which make it isomorphic to $\mathcal{E}^*(\mathrm{m})$ and a compatible p-dimensional family of Kähler structures with the following properties*

1. *The restriction of the Kähler structures is a multiple of L^2-metric in every fibre,*
2. *The Kähler structure is invariant by the mapping class group action,*
3. *The zero section is totally geodesic,*
4. *The metric induced on the zero section is Weil–Petersson metric.*

The L^2-metric on $H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{K}^m)$ is taken with respect of the hyperbolic metric on Σ.

We explain the construction of Kim and Zhang in [29] given in the cubic case which extends with only slight modifications to the general case. We reproduce the proof here, with some small simplifications, in order to get more specific details on the property of the Kähler metrics that we construct.

9.1. **Positive Hermitian bundles.** Let $E \to X$ be a holomorphic bundle over a complex manifold X equipped with a Hermitian metric h. Let ∇ be the Chern connection and R^∇ be the Chern curvature that we see as a tensor element of $\Omega^2(\mathsf{T}_{\mathbb{C}}X, \mathrm{End}(E))$. We then define a 2-tensor Θ on $\mathsf{T}_{\mathbb{C}}X \otimes \mathrm{End}(E)$ by

$$\Theta(Y \otimes u, Z \otimes v) := i\, h\left(R^\nabla\,(Y, Z)\; u, v\right). \tag{151}$$

Using the symmetry of the curvature tensor, one gets that Θ is Hermitian quadratic. We now say that (See [21], Definition 3.9 in [14])

- the Hermitian bundle E is *Nakano positive* if Θ is Hermitian positive,
- the Hermitian bundle E is *Griffiths positive* if for all non zero decomposable vectors $X \otimes u$, $\Theta(X \otimes u, X \otimes u) > 0$,
- the Hermitian bundle E is *Griffiths negative* if for all non zero decomposable vectors $X \otimes u$, $\Theta(X \otimes u, X \otimes u) < 0$,

From the definitions one immediately gets the following facts.

(1) a Nakano positive bundle is Griffiths positive,
(2) the sum of Nakano positive is Nakano positive,
(3) the dual of a Griffiths positive bundle is Griffiths negative,

As an easy consequence, the following seems well known to complex geometers.

Proposition 9.1.1. [Kähler Metric on the total space]
Let $\pi : \mathcal{E} \to X$ be a holomorphic bundle over a complex manifold equipped with a Griffiths negative Hermitian metric h that we consider as a fibrewise quadratic function. Assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is equipped with an holomorphic action of some group Γ preserving the Hermitian metric h and a Kähler metric g on X. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$H := \varepsilon\, \partial\overline{\partial} h + \pi^* g,$$

is a Γ-invariant Kähler metric on $\mathcal{E}$. Furthermore

(1) H is linear along the fibre,
(2) the zero section is a totally geodesic isometric immersion.

Compare with the content of the proof of Theorem 5.4 in [29].

Proof. Let σ be a holomorphic section of $\mathcal{E}$. A classical computation (Proposition 3.1.5 of [30]) says that $\partial\overline{\partial}\,(h(\sigma))$ is positive. Thus h is a plurisubharmonic function on $\mathcal{E}$. Since $\varepsilon\, \partial\overline{\partial} h$ is positive along the fibres, we get that H is a Kähler metric. Since $u \mapsto -u$ is an isometry of H whose fixed point is the zero section, the zero section is totally geodesic. The other statements are obvious by construction. □

9.2. **Pushforward bundles.** Theorem 1.2. in Bo Berndtsson [5] is a powerful way to assert the positivity of bundles.

Theorem 9.2.1. [Berndtsson] *Let $\pi : X \to Y$ be a holomorphic fibration with non singular and compact fibres. Assume X is Kähler. We denote by X_y the fibre over $y \in Y$. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a positive line bundle on Y. Then the vector bundle over Y whose fibre at y is*

$$H^0(X_y, \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{K}_{X/Y}),$$

equipped with the L^2-metric, is Nakano positive.

As a consequence, we obtain as in [29]

Proposition 9.2.2. [Inkang Kim–Genkhai Zhang] *The holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{E}_m$ equipped with the L^2 metric is Nakano positive.*

Proof. We apply Theorem 9.2.1 to the following situation: Y is Teichmüller space, X is the Teichmüller curve, $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{K}_{X/Y}^{m-1}$ is the canonical bundle of the fibre to the power $m-1$. Then at a Riemann surface Σ,

$$H^0(X_y, \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{K}_{X/Y}) = H^0(\Sigma, \mathcal{K}_\Sigma^n) = (\mathcal{E}_n)_\Sigma.$$

It remains to check the hypothesis. Indeed

- $\mathcal{L}$ is positive by Lemma 5.8 of [48],
- X is Kähler, as a consequence, being the base of a positive line bundle.

The result follows. □

Since the sum of Nakano positive bundles is Nakano positive, we immediately get that the bundle $\mathcal{E}(\mathrm{m})$ is Nakano positive, where $\mathrm{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_\ell)$. Thus using our preliminary remarks, we have

Proposition 9.2.3. *The bundle $\mathcal{E}^*(\mathrm{m})$ is Griffiths negative.*

9.3. **The Kähler property.** In order to get 9.0.1, we apply Proposition 9.1.1 to $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{E}^*(\mathrm{m})$ using Proposition 9.2.3.

Actually we have a family of Kähler metrics since we have a natural holomorphic $\mathbb{C}^p$ action on $\mathcal{E}^*(\mathrm{m})$.

By construction the metric is invariant under the mapping class group.

Since furthermore the metric is invariant by rotation in the fibres, the zero section is totally geodesic. Furthermore, by construction the zero section is an isometry from Y into $\mathcal{F}$.

10. Area rigidity

For any split real rank 2 group G_0, let $c(\mathsf{G}_0)$ be the curvature of the totally geodesic hyperbolic plane associated to the principal SL_2 in G_0. Our goal is to prove in this section the following

Theorem 10.0.1. *Let δ be a Hitchin representation of $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ in G_0 where G_0 has rank 2. Then*

$$\mathrm{MinArea}(\delta) \geqslant c(\mathsf{G}_0)\, \chi(S),$$

with equality only if δ is Fuchsian.

10.1. **Forms.** Using the notation given in the decomposition (44), let us consider for any $a \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ the 2-form

$$\Omega_a := \langle a \mid \omega \wedge \omega \rangle \in \Omega^2(\mathsf{X}). \tag{152}$$

Then we have the following result

Proposition 10.1.1. *For any $a \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, the form Ω_a is closed. Moreover, for any δ in the Hitchin component, let Σ_δ be the unique minimal surface in $\mathsf{X}/\delta(\pi_1(\Sigma))$ then $\int_{\Sigma_\delta} \Omega_a$ does not depend on δ.*

Proof. By equation (42),

$$\omega \wedge \omega = -R^\nabla - \mathrm{d}^\nabla \omega.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} -\Omega_a &= \langle a \mid \mathrm{d}^\nabla \omega \rangle + \langle a \mid R^\nabla \rangle \\ &= \mathrm{d} \langle a \mid \omega \rangle + \langle a \mid R^\nabla \rangle . \end{aligned} \tag{153}$$

Thus Ω_a is closed (by the Bianchi identity) and in the same cohomology class as $-\langle a \mid R^\nabla \rangle$. Since R^∇ is the curvature of the T-bundle, choosing a to be integral, $\mathsf{G} \to \mathsf{G}/\mathsf{T}$, it follows that there exists a constant $a(\mathsf{G}_0)$ and an S^1-bundle P_a over X so that $\frac{1}{b(\mathsf{G}_0)}\Omega_a$ is the curvature of P_a. In particular

$$f_a(\delta) := \frac{1}{b(\mathsf{G}_0)} \int_{\Sigma_\delta} \Omega_a \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Since $f_a(\delta)$ depends continuously on δ, $f_a(\delta)$ is constant. The result extend by linearity to all a. □

Let us now consider the following 2-forms on X (using the convention of paragraph 4.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_0 &:= i \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} \langle \omega_{-\alpha} | \omega_\alpha \rangle \\ \Omega_1 &:= i \langle \omega_\eta | \omega_{-\eta} \rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{154}$$

Then we have

Proposition 10.1.2. *The form Ω_0 and Ω_1 are positive on any cyclic surface. Moreover if Σ be a cyclic surface in X_0 and p is the projection of X_0 to $\mathsf{S}(G_0)$, then*

$$\int_\Sigma \Omega_0 + \Omega_1 = \mathrm{Area}(p(\Sigma)).$$

Proof. Recall that for a cyclic surface ω_η and $\omega_{-\alpha}$ are of type $(1,0)$ for $\alpha \in \Pi$ and $\omega_{-\beta} = -\rho(\omega_\beta)$. Thus the positivity of Ω_0 and Ω_1 on cyclic surfaces follows from Proposition 4.1.1. From Equation (70), it follows

$$\mathrm{Area}(p(\Sigma)) = i. \int_\Sigma \langle \Phi | \Phi^\dagger \rangle.$$

Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &= \omega_\eta + \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} \omega_{-\alpha}, \\ \Phi^\dagger &= \omega_{-\eta} + \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} \omega_\alpha. \end{aligned} \tag{155}$$

Thus since $\mathcal{G}_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{G}_\beta$ are orthogonal with respect to the Killing form unless $\alpha+\beta = 0$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} i\,\langle \Phi|\Phi^\dagger\rangle &= i\,\langle \omega_\eta|\omega_{-\eta}\rangle + i\,\sum_{\alpha\in\Pi}\langle\omega_{-\alpha}|\omega_\alpha\rangle \\ &= \Omega_0 + \Omega_1. \end{aligned}$$

□

We finally will need

Proposition 10.1.3. *Let Π be the set of simple roots in G_0. There there exists a unique element u_0 in $\mathfrak{h}^*$, such that for any simple root α and $X \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$, $Y \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, we have*

$$\langle X|Y\rangle = \langle u_0 \mid [X,Y]\rangle\,.$$

Moreover, there exists a positive constant k_0, so that if $X \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\eta}$, $Y \in \mathfrak{g}_\eta$, we have

$$k_0\,\langle X|Y\rangle = \langle u_0 \mid [X,Y]\rangle\,.$$

Proof: Let us choose a Chevalley basis $\{\mathrm{x}_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Delta}$. Let us write $X = x\,\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha}$, $Y = y\,\mathrm{x}_\alpha$, then

$$\langle X|Y\rangle = x\,y\,\langle \mathrm{x}_\alpha|\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha}\rangle.$$

On the other hand

$$\langle u_0 \mid [X,Y]\rangle = -x\,y\,\langle u_0|h_\alpha\rangle.$$

Thus u_0 is uniquely determined by

$$\langle u_0|h_\alpha\rangle = -\langle \mathrm{x}_\alpha|\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha}\rangle.$$

We may choose a Cartan involution so that $\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha} = \rho(\mathrm{x}_\alpha)$. Thus $\langle \mathrm{x}_\alpha|\mathrm{x}_{-\alpha}\rangle < 0$. Since

$$h_\eta = \sum_{\alpha\in\Pi} r_\alpha\,h_\alpha,$$

with $r_\alpha > 0$. It follows that

$$\langle u_0|h_\eta\rangle > 0.$$

In particular, if $X \in \mathfrak{g}_\eta$ and $Y \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\eta}$ we have

$$k_0\,\langle X|Y\rangle = \langle u_0 \mid [X,Y]\rangle\,,$$

where

$$k_0 = -\frac{\langle u_0|h_\eta\rangle}{\langle \mathrm{x}_\eta|\mathrm{x}_{-\eta}\rangle} > 0.$$

As a corollary of this proposition one obtains immediately

Corollary 10.1.4. *Let u_0 be defined as in Proposition 10.1.3 and $v_0 = i\,u_0$, then*

$$\Omega_{v_0} = \Omega_0 - k_0\,\Omega_1.$$

10.2. **Proof of the Area Rigidity Theorem.** We can now prove Theorem 10.0.1. From Corollary 10.1.4 and Proposition 10.1.2, on gets that

$$\mathrm{Area}(\pi(\Sigma_\delta)) = \int_{\Sigma_\delta} \Omega_{v_0} + (k_0+1)\int_{\Sigma_\delta} \Omega_1 \,. \tag{156}$$

If δ_0 is a Fuchsian representation, then the corresponding cyclic surface is Fuchsian (see Proposition 6.0.6) and thus ω_η and Ω_1 vanish. Thus we get that if δ_0 is Fuchsian

$$\int_{\Sigma_{\delta_0}} \Omega_{v_0} = \mathrm{Area}(\Sigma_{\delta_0}) = c(\mathsf{G}_0)\chi(S)\,. \tag{157}$$

By Proposition 10.1.1 $\int_{\Sigma_\delta} \Omega_{v_0}$ does not depend on δ. It thus follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{MinArea}(\delta) &= \mathrm{Area}(\pi(\Sigma_\delta)) \\ &= c(\mathsf{G}_0)\chi(S) + (k_0+1)\int_{\Sigma_\delta} \Omega_1\,. \end{aligned}\tag{158}$$

The result now follows from the fact that Ω_1 is positive on cyclic surfaces by Proposition 10.1.2. Moreover Ω_1 vanishes if and only if ω_η vanishes, but ω_η vanishes if and only if the Higgs field takes values in $\sum_{\alpha\in\Pi}\mathcal{G}_\alpha$ that is, δ is Fuchsian (see Theorem 5.2.2).

References

[1] Michael T Anderson, *Complete minimal hypersurfaces in hyperbolic n-manifolds*, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici **58** (1983), no. 2, 264–290.

[2] Michael F Atiyah and Raoul Bott, *The Yang-Mills equations over Riemann surfaces*, Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **308** (1983), no. 1505, 523–615.

[3] David Baraglia, *Cyclic Higgs bundles and the affine Toda equations*, arXiv (2010).

[4] Yves Benoist and Dominique Hulin, *Cubic differentials and hyperbolic convex sets*, Journal of Differential Geometry **98** (2014), no. 1, 1–19.

[5] Bo Berndtsson, *Curvature of vector bundles associated to holomorphic fibrations*, Annals of Mathematics **169** (2009), no. 2, 531–560.

[6] John Bolton, Franz Pedit, and Lyndon Woodward, *Minimal surfaces and the affine Toda field model*, Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik **459** (1995), 119–150.

[7] Francesco Bonsante and Jean-Marc Schlenker, *Maximal surfaces and the universal Teichmüller space*, Inventiones Mathematicae **182** (2010), no. 2, 279–333.

[8] Nicolas Bourbaki, *Lie groups and Lie algebras. Chapters 7–9*, Elements of Mathematics (Berlin), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.

[9] Steven B Bradlow, Oscar García-Prada, and Peter B Gothen, *Deformations of maximal representations in* $\mathrm{Sp}(4,\mathbb{R})$, The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics **63** (2012), no. 4, 795–843.

[10] Martin J Bridgeman, Richard Canary, François Labourie, and Andres Sambarino, *The pressure metric for convex representations*, arXiv.org (2013).

[11] Suhyoung Choi and William M Goldman, *Convex real projective structures on closed surfaces are closed*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **118** (1993), no. 2, 657–661.

[12] Brian Collier and François Labourie, *Cyclic surfaces in products of hyperbolic planes*, in preparation.

[13] Brian Collier and Qiongling Li, *Asymptotics of certain families of Higgs bundles in the Hitchin component*, arXiv.org (2014).

[14] Jean-Pierre Demailly, *Analytic methods in algebraic geometry*, Surveys of Modern Mathematics, vol. 1, International Press, Somerville, MA, 2012.

[15] Simon K Donaldson, *Twisted harmonic maps and the self-duality equations*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society. Third Series **55** (1987), no. 1, 127–131.

[16] David Dumas and Michael Wolf, *Polynomial cubic differentials and convex polygons in the projective plane*, arXiv.org (2014).

[17] Vladimir V Fock and Alexander B Goncharov, *Moduli spaces of local systems and higher Teichmüller theory*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. (2006), no. 103, 1–211.
[18] Oscar García-Prada, Peter B Gothen, and Ignasi Mundet i Riera, *Higgs bundles and surface group representations in the real symplectic group*, Journal of Topology **6** (2013), no. 1, 64–118.
[19] Oscar García-Prada and Ignasi Mundet i Riera, *Representations of the fundamental group of a closed oriented surface in* $\mathrm{Sp}(4,\mathbb{R})$, Topology **43** (2004), no. 4, 831–855.
[20] William M Goldman, *The symplectic nature of fundamental groups of surfaces*, Advances in Mathematics **54** (1984), no. 2, 200–225.
[21] Phillip A Griffiths, *Hermitian differential geometry and the theory of positive and ample holomorphic vector bundles*, J. Math. Mech. **14** (1965), 117–140.
[22] Olivier Guichard and Anna Wienhard, *Convex foliated projective structures and the Hitchin component for* $\mathrm{PSL}_4(\mathbf{R})$, Duke Mathematical Journal **144** (2008), no. 3, 381–445.
[23] ———, *Anosov representations: domains of discontinuity and applications*, Inventiones Mathematicae **190** (2012), no. 2, 357–438.
[24] II Gulliver, Robert Osserman, and Halsey L Royden, *A theory of branched immersions of surfaces*, American Journal of Mathematics **95** (1973), 750–812.
[25] Nigel J Hitchin, *The self-duality equations on a Riemann surface*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society. Third Series **55** (1987), no. 1, 59–126.
[26] ———, *Lie groups and Teichmüller space*, Topology **31** (1992), no. 3, 449–473.
[27] Zheng Huang and Biao Wang, *Counting Minimal Surfaces in Quasi-Fuchsian three-Manifolds*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1204.4944 (2012).
[28] Anatole Katok, *Entropy and closed geodesics*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **2** (1982), no. 3-4, 339–365 (1983).
[29] Inkang Kim and Genkai Zhang, *Kahler metric on Hitchin component*, arXiv.org (2013).
[30] Shoshichi Kobayashi, *Differential geometry of complex vector bundles*, Publications of the Mathematical Society of Japan, vol. 15, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1987.
[31] Bertram Kostant, *The principal three-dimensional subgroup and the Betti numbers of a complex simple Lie group*, American Journal of Mathematics **81** (1959), 973–1032.
[32] ———, *Lie group representations on polynomial rings*, American Journal of Mathematics **85** (1963), 327–404.
[33] François Labourie, $\mathbb{R}P^2$*-structures et differentielles cubiques holomorphes.* , Proceedings of the GARC Conference in Differential Geometry, Seoul National University, 1997., February 1997.
[34] ———, *Anosov flows, surface groups and curves in projective space*, Inventiones Mathematicae **165** (2006), no. 1, 51–114.
[35] ———, *Flat Projective Structures on Surfaces and Cubic Holomorphic Differentials*, Pure Appl. Math. Q. **3** (2007), no. 4, 1057–1099.
[36] ———, *Cross Ratios, Anosov Representations and the Energy Functional on Teichmüller Space.*, Annales Scientifiques de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure. Quatrième Série (2008), 1–38.
[37] François Labourie and Richard Wentworth, *Variations along the Fuchsian locus*, arXiv.org (2015).
[38] Qiongling Li, *Teichmüller Space Is Totally Geodesic In Goldman Space*, arXiv.org (2013).
[39] John C Loftin, *Affine spheres and convex* $\mathbb{RP}^n$*-manifolds*, American Journal of Mathematics **123** (2001), no. 2, 255–274.
[40] Rafael Potrie and Andres Sambarino, *Eigenvalues and Entropy of a Hitchin representation*, arXiv.org (2014).
[41] John Sacks and Karen Uhlenbeck, *The existence of minimal immersions of* 2*-spheres*, Annals of Mathematics **113** (1981), no. 1, 1–24.
[42] ———, *Minimal immersions of closed Riemann surfaces*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **271** (1982), no. 2, 639–652.
[43] Andrew Sanders, *Hitchin harmonic maps are immersions*, arXiv.org (2014).
[44] Richard M Schoen, *The role of harmonic mappings in rigidity and deformation problems*, Complex geometry (Osaka, 1990), Dekker, New York, 1993, pp. 179–200.
[45] Richard M Schoen and Shing-Tung Yau, *Existence of incompressible minimal surfaces and the topology of three-dimensional manifolds with nonnegative scalar curvature*, Annals of Mathematics **110** (1979), no. 1, 127–142.

[46] Carlos T Simpson, *Constructing variations of Hodge structure using Yang-Mills theory and applications to uniformization*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **1** (1988), no. 4, 867–918.
[47] Michael Wolf, *The Teichmüller theory of harmonic maps*, Journal of Differential Geometry **29** (1989), no. 2, 449–479.
[48] Scott A Wolpert, *Chern forms and the Riemann tensor for the moduli space of curves*, Inventiones Mathematicae **85** (1986), no. 1, 119–145.

Univ. Nice Sophia Antipolis, Laboratoire J.-A. Dieudonné, Nice